arXiv:hep-th/9211100v2 25 Nov 1992

November, 1992
CALT-68-1825

Foundations of Rational Quantum Field Theory, I

Doron Gepner[⋆]

Division of Physics, Mathematics and Astronomy
Mail Code 452–48
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, CA 91125

ABSTRACT

The connection between Rational Conformal Field Theory (RCFT), $N = 2$ massive supersymmetric field theory, and solvable Interaction Round the Face (IRF) lattice models is explored here. Specifically, one identifies the fusion rings with the chiral rings. The theories so obtained are conjectured, and largely shown, to be integrable. A variety of examples and the structure of the metric in moduli space are given. The kink scattering theory is given by the Boltzmann weights of an IRF model, which is built entirely in terms of the conformal data of the original RCFT. This procedure produces all solvable IRF models in terms of projection operators of the RCFT. The soliton structure and their scattering amplitudes are described. A host of new rational conformal field theories are constructed generalizing most, if not all, of the known ones.

[⋆] On leave from: Department of Nuclear Physics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel. HEPTH# 9211100.

1. Introduction

Two dimensional field theories play an important role in the understanding of phenomena as diverse as string unified theories, exact quantum field theories and a variety of solid state systems. Importantly, such theories offer the possibility of exact solvability. There are four related, though different approaches to solvable two dimensional physics. These are integrable field theories, solvable lattice models, factorizable soliton systems and rational conformal field theories. Our purpose in this paper is to establish that all four problems are essentially the same, and that solving or classifying one of them, leads to such a solution in all the others. More precisely, in the language of category theory, we establish an explicit isomorphism between the following four categories. 1) Integrable $N = 2$ supersymmetric field theory. 2) Rational conformal field theories. 3) Solvable fusion interaction round the face lattice models. 4) Factorizable soliton systems. The isomorphisms are general to **all** such systems, and in particular cover all the examples known in the literature.

The initial idea is the following conjecture that we set out to establish: all integrable $N = 2$ supersymmetric field theories are in one to one relation with rational conformal field theories. The mapping of a given RCFT to an $N = 2$ supersymmetric field theory is done by the identification of the fusion ring of the rational conformal field theory (RCFT) with the chiral ring of the $N = 2$ supersymmetric theory. This is the first isomorphism of categories discussed above, and the key to the others. Our purpose in this paper, and in its sequel, ref. [1], is to establish this basic theorem.

The other isomorphisms fit naturally into this picture, and are, in fact, to a large extent, evoked by it. The second one maps any given RCFT onto a solvable interaction round the face lattice model (IRF). The way this is done is by setting the vertex variables of the lattice model to be the primary fields of the RCFT. The admissibility condition for the allowed lattice configuration is given by the fusion rules of the RCFT, $a \sim b$ if, and only if, $N^{b}_{a,\alpha} > 0$, where a and b are vertex primary fields, α is some fixed primary fields, and $N_{a,\alpha}^{b}$ is the fusion coefficient (actually, two different, horizontal and vertical, admissibility conditions are eventually used, for the general case). The Boltzmann weights need to satisfy the star triangle equation (STE) for the lattice model to be solvable, and for them to lead to commuting transfer matrices (see, e.g., ref. [2] and references therein). We solve the STE relation by letting the Boltzmann weights be the extension of the braiding matrices of the rational anomalous field theories. These automatically satisfy the braid group relations, and thus the STE at the extreme UV limit, as well as giving the correct admissibility relation. We then describe a universal way to introduce spectral parameters, using properties of the braiding matrices of RCFT and, in particular, the fact that they obey the n'th order braid algebra introduced here, which generalizes the A type Hecke algebra, (which corresponds to $n = 2$). The Boltzmann weights are given by projectors onto each eigenvalue times a universal function which depends only on the conformal dimensions. All the known solvable IRF models (in the trigonometric limit) are rederived by this mapping, along with a considerable number of new ones. This gives also a unified formulation for IRF models, and a way to treat them using RCFT methods.

From a solvable IRF model we build an integrable soliton system by letting the vacua stand for the vertex primary fields, and letting the solitons stand for the primary fields appearing in the admissibility conditions. The Boltzmann weights then become essentially the soliton scattering amplitudes (up to factors ensuring unitarity and crossing symmetry, which are described in general), and the spectral parameter becomes the relative rapidity of the scattered solitons. This type of map was established before on a case–by–case basis (for a review see, e.g., ref. [3]) and is described here, in general.

The STE relation then implies the crucial factorization equation ref. [4], which ensures the integrability of the soliton scattering theory. Thus we find a unique way (up to, so called, CDD ambiguities) to map any solvable IRF model onto any integrable soliton system, recovering, in particular, all the known soliton systems.

Finally, the soliton systems described here are in fact the solutions to the massive $N = 2$ supersymmetric field theory based on any given RCFT (up to a trivial duplication of solitons required for supersymmetry), thus giving the last isomorphism, along with the solution for the particle content of the theories, and their scattering amplitudes.

This completes the circle of categorical isomorphisms, establishing that all the four categories are equivalent. Further, various operations, such as fusion (IRF), fusion (RCFT) and Bootstrap (RCFT), are category morphisms, i.e., they commute with the isomorphisms, or in physical language, are equivalent to each other, under the aforementioned maps. Another example is the quotient procedure (orbifoldization) in RCFT, versus that in IRF models [5]. Yet another example, is the transition to an extended algebra in RCFT, versus the folding procedure in IRF models (e.g., refs. [6, 3]). This ensures the consistency of the entire picture.

The original conjecture about the integrability of $N = 2$ massive theories is then verified by a thermodynamic Bethe ansatz calculation of the algebraic central charge, along with a calculation of the metric in moduli space of the $N = 2$ theory, which will be reported in ref. [1], thus proving it.

The entire work puts together four central physical problems and shows their equivalence. Further, it allows the use of methods from one category in another. For example, from RCFT data one builds an IRF model, which is then solved to give a multiple critical point structure that gives back the full RCFT, solving the so called reconstruction 'fantasy' problem of RCFT.

This paper is organized as follows. In section (2), an introduction to this framework is described using as a concrete set of examples the known integrable $N = 2$ models and showing that they all stem from RCFT's. In section (3) the connection with metric and kinks is introduced. In sections (4), (5) and (6) new rational conformal field theories are introduced, including new types of cosets. The conformal data is introduced in sections (4) and (5) and the realizations in section (6). The systems generalize all known RCFT systems (with the exclusion, perhaps, of some rational orbifolds) along with providing a host of new ones. In sections (7) (the two block case) and (9), the general case, fusion IRF models are constructed from their corresponding RCFT theories and the Boltzmann weights are explicitly described. In section (8) the graph state IRF case is explored, along with a number of examples. In section (10) fusion soliton theories are treated, giving their S matrices. Finally, in section (11) we discuss this work, indicating also the results that will appear in [1], along with other future directions.

2. Fusion Scalar Field Theories

Let us consider the potential,

$$V(q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_m) = \sum_{n=1}^{m} \frac{q_n^k}{k} - \lambda q_n \tag{2.1}$$

expressed, in terms of the symmetric variables

$$x_r = \sum_{i_1<i_2<\ldots<i_r} q_{i_1} q_{i_2} \ldots q_{i_r}. \tag{2.2}$$

Here λ is the coupling constant. The potential V may be used as a superpotential of an $N=2$ scalar field theory, or a Landau–Ginzburg theory. As was discussed in refs. [8], for $\lambda = 0$, this potential describes the hermitian symmetric model [10] $SU(m+1)/SU(m) \times U(1)$. The perturbation at $\lambda \neq 0$ is known to be integrable, and the solitonic spectrum and S matrices have been found or have been convincingly conjectured [11, 12, 13].

A closely related set of ideas [8, 9] is the tight connection between fusion potentials in rational conformal field theory and integrable $N=2$ supersymmetric models. We would like to examine this class of theories from this particular angle. Specifically, we will construct a rational conformal field theory whose fusion ring is given by the potential V. We shall then further establish that the rational conformal field theory essentially solves the $N=2$ one, and allows one to derive the solitonic scattering amplitudes (section (10)).

Consider then the potential V, eq. (1), with the coupling set to $\lambda = (-1)^m$. As was discussed in ref. [8] the points of the variety

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial x_i} = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

form a diagonal basis for the fusion ring. We shall denote the solutions of eq. (3) by x_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, q$, and refer to this set of points as the fusion variety. The primary fields $[p]$ are also numbered as $p = 1, 2, \ldots q$, and form a basis for the fusion ring $P[x_i]/\partial_i V$. At the points x_i, the primary fields assume the values [8],

$$[p](x_i) = S^{\dagger}_{p,i}/S_{p,1}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $S_{p,q}$ is the matrix of torus modular transformations, and “1” denotes the unit primary field.

For the potential V, eq. (1), the fusion variety is readily found via eq. (3),

$$q_i = e^{2\pi i(r_i-(m-1)/2)/k}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \ldots \leq r_m < k$ is a monotonic sequence which labels the solutions. The x_i are computed by substituting the q_i, eq. (5), into eq. (2).

We face, the problem of how to define the primary fields. Clearly, this is a very special basis for the fusion ring, where the structure constants are non–negative integers, and, in which, eq. (4) holds. There is no systematic way of doing this, and in fact the same potential may in principle correspond to different rational conformal field theories, albeit, no such examples are known[⋆]. Thus, we

---

[⋆] It is conjectured below that the primary fields basis is the unique one which diagonalizes the metric. This is true for all examples in which the metric have been calculated. This implies, in particular, that for each potential there is a unique basis of primary fields which is consistent, and which can be unequivocally found by calculating the metric (c.f., section (3)).

essentially need to guess the expression for the primary fields, and then check that it is a consistent one. The natural form is a Weyl–type formula,

$$[r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_m] = \frac{\sum_{w\in S_m} (-1)^w \prod_i q_{w(i)}^{r_i}}{\prod_{i<j}(q_i - q_j)}. \tag{2.6}$$

The denominator, being the Vandermonde determinant, can be written also by a summation formula

$$\prod_{i<j}(q_i - q_j) = \sum_{w\in S_m} \prod_i (-1)^w q_{w(i)}^{i-1}, \tag{2.7}$$

which shows that the field $[0, 1, \ldots, m-1]$ indeed corresponds to the unit polynomials, using eq. (6). Here S_m stands for the permutation group of m elements, and $(-1)^w$ is 1 (-1) when w is an even (odd) permutation. The polynomials, eq. (6), are symmetric functions of the q_i, and thus can be expressed in terms of the x_i which are the generators of the symmetric polynomials. The matrix S can now be computed from eq. (4),

$$S_{r_i;s_i} = \frac{1}{[m(k+m)]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum (-1)^w e^{2\pi i (r_i-(m-1)/2)(s_{w(i)}-(m-1)/2)/k}. \tag{2.8}$$

It can be verified that this S matrix is unitary, $S^\dagger = S$, which is required for the consistency of the theory. Since S is symmetric in r and s, and further since this S matrix obeys eq. (4) above, it follows that the fusion rules defined by S are identical to the product of polynomials, eq. (6), along with the relations derived from the potential V, eq. (3). Moreover, it can be checked that $S^2 = (ST)^3 = C$, where C is the charge conjugation matrix

$$C_{r_i;s_i} = \sum_w \prod_i \delta(r_i + s_{w(i)} - m + 1), \tag{2.9}$$

where $\delta(q) = 0$ unless q is divisible by k, and then $\delta(q) = 1$. The sum, eq. (9), is over all permutations w. For each primary field p, there is a unique conjugate one

$\bar{p}$, such that $C_{p,\bar{p}} = 1$, and all other matrix elements of C vanish. Clearly, also, $C^2 = 1$. T is the generator of the modular transformation $\tau \to \tau + 1$, which is the diagonal matrix

$$T_{p,q} = \exp[2\pi i(\Delta_p - c/24)]\delta_{p,q}, \tag{2.10}$$

where Δ_p is the dimension of the primary field p. The dimension formula can be seen to be

$$\Delta_{r_i} = \frac{1}{2k}\sum_i [r_i - (m-1)/2]^2 - \frac{1}{24k}(m^2-1)(m+2). \tag{2.11}$$

The constant c which is the central charge of the Virasoro algebra is

$$c = \frac{(k-m)(m^2-1)}{k} + 1. \tag{2.12}$$

The above formulae for S, T, C, Δ and c follows directly from consistency with respect to the proposed fusion rules. It is shown in the sequel that the fusion coefficients are all, indeed, non–negative integers.

It is convenient to introduce Young tableau notation for the fields in the theory by letting the 'signature' series $r_i - i + 1$ stand for the width of the i'th row in the tableau. See an example in fig. (2.1). It is also convenient to introduce a dual notation, where $[r_i] \equiv (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k)$, $r_m \leq k+m-1$, and $0 \leq s_i \leq s_i + 1 \ldots, \leq m$, where s_i stands for the height of i'th column in the Young tableau. The relation between s_i and r_i is, that the series $\{r_i - i + 1\} \cup \{s_i - 1\}$ is identical to the series $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, \max(k, m)\}$. Alternatively $[s_i + i - 1]$ describes the transpose of the young tableau of $[r_i]$. Now, one can write down a Schubert–like calculus for the fusion rules of the theory. The generators are the 'fundamental fields', $y_r = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, r) = [0, 1, \ldots, m-r, m-r+2, m-r+3 \ldots, m+1]$. The products of the field y_r with any primary field in the theory are expressed by the Pieri formula (see, for example, ref. [14]),

$$y_r(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k) = \sum_{\substack{s_i \le p_i < s_{i+1} \\ \sum p_i = \sum s_i + r}} (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_m). \tag{2.13}$$

From the Pieri formula one may derive also a Giambelli formula expressing the general primary field as a polynomial in the generators. In fact, the primary fields are the usual Schure functions for S_m, and the formula expressing them in terms of the generators is the Jacoby–Trudi formula (see, e.g., [15]),

$$(s_i) = \det_{i,j} y_{s_i+i-j}, \tag{2.14}$$

where $y_0 = 1$, and $y_n = 0$ for $n > m$, by convention. As is well known, there is a duality upon the exchange of k and m, which is essentially the transposition of Young tableau [15]. This is equivalent to the exchange of $r_i - i + 1$ with s_i. Eq. (14), the Jacobi-Trudi, still holds in terms of the generators which are the totally symmetric Young tableaux, $Z_r = (0, 0, 1, \ldots, 1)$, where there are r 1's, i.e.,

$$[r_i] = \det_{i,j} Z_{r_i+1-j}, \tag{2.15}$$

where $Z_0 = 1$ and by convention, $Z_i = 0$ for $i < 0$.

Rather than dwell any further on the aforementioned relations, we will directly establish a realization of these fusion rules as conformal fields theories, from which they will follow. To do so, consider the conformal field theory,

$$U(1)_{m(k+m)} \times SU(m)_k, \tag{2.16}$$

which can be realized as a free boson propagating on a circle of radius $\sqrt{m(k+m)}$ (for the U(1) part) and a level k $SU(m)$ WZNW theory [16, 17, 18]. The general primary field in the theory is represented by the product

$$\Phi_q^\lambda = g^\lambda e^{iq\phi/\sqrt{m(m+k)}}, \tag{2.17}$$

where q is an integer, λ is an integrable highest weight at level k of $\widehat{\mathrm{SU}}(N)$, and g^λ is a primary fields with this weight and highest weight. The dimension of the primary fields is

$$\Delta = \frac{m\lambda(\lambda + 2\rho) + q^2}{2m(k+m)}. \tag{2.18}$$

Actually, the theory eq. (16) admits an extended chiral algebra, and we can organize the primary fields into representations of this larger algebra. We assume that k is an odd integer. Then, we can use as an extended current algebra the holomorphic field of integral dimension $H = \Phi^0_{m(k+m)}$, Further, we can define the extended algebra currents,

$$J_r = \Phi^{k\lambda_r}_{r(k+m)}, \tag{2.19}$$

where λ_r, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, are any of the fundamental weights of $SU(m)$. It can be checked that the J_r are holomorphic fields of the integral dimension,

$$\Delta_r = \frac{r(k+r)}{2}. \tag{2.20}$$

The extension of the algebra to include the field $H = \Phi^0_{m(k+m)}$ implies that the charge q is defined modulo $m(k+m)$, as the fields Φ^λ_q and $\Phi^\lambda_{q+m(k+m)}$, are related by the appropriate operator product expansion with respect to H. Next, there is a requirement that the fields will be local with respect to the new currents J_i. This implies that in the operator product $J_i(z)\Phi^\lambda_q(w) = \Phi^{\sigma_r(\lambda)}_{q+r(k+m)}(w)(z-w)^\delta + \text{h.o.t}$ only integral values of δ are allowed to appear. Here $\sigma^r(\lambda)$ denotes the external automorphism of the extended Dynkin diagrams. Using eq. (18), it follows that

$$c(\lambda) = m\lambda\lambda_m = q \mod m, \tag{2.21}$$

where $c(\lambda)$ mod m is the m-ality of the weight λ. In addition, the action, in the operator product sense, of the new currents identifies the fields

$$\Phi^{\sigma^r(\lambda)}_{q+r(k+m)}, \tag{2.22}$$

for any integer r (defined modulo m) . In terms of the Dynkin labels l_i, defined below, the automorphism is

$$\sigma(l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_m) = (k - \sum l_i, l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_{m-1}). \tag{2.23}$$

Let us demonstrate that indeed the conformal field theory $SU(m) \times U(1)$ is a realization of the fusion ring described above. First, note that the central charges are indeed identical, since the $U(1)$ factor contributes the central charge $c = 1$, while $SU(m)_k$ has the central charge $c = k(m^2 - 1)/(k + m)$. Shifting k to $k - m$ we find that the central charge so obtained is identical to the one found earlier, eq. (12). To describe the correspondence between the fields, it is convenient to introduce the signature of the Young tableau $t_i = \sum_{j=m+1-1}^{m-1} l_j + i - 1$, where $i = 2, 3, \ldots, m$, $t_1 = 0$, and where the l_j, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$, are the Dynkin labels of the representation; $\lambda = \sum_i l_i \lambda_i$, where λ_i are the fundamental weights. The t_i form a strictly monotonically increasing sequence, $0 = t_1 < t_2 < \ldots < t_m < k + m - 1$. Conversely, any such sequence describes an integrable highest weight at the level k. Now, the primary field $[r_i]$, defined by eq. (6), uniquely maps to the primary field Φ^t_q, where the signature t is defined as $t_i = r_{i+1} - r_1$, and the charge q is given by $q = \sum r_i - i$, or,

$$[r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_m] \longrightarrow \Phi_q^{t_2, t_3, \ldots, t_m}. \tag{2.24}$$

To prove this equation, we make use of the Weyl character formula to show that the S matrix, eq. (8), decomposes into a product of an $SU(m)$ modular matrix, at the level k, with a $U(1)$ factor, at the level $m(k + m)$. Denote the weight by λ, as before. The simple roots of $SU(m)$ are given by $e_i - e_{i+1}$, where $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$, and the e_i form an orthonormal set of unit vectors. Up to an overall addition of a term proportional to $e_1 + e_2 + \ldots + e_m$, the fundamental weights are given by $\lambda^r = -\sum_{r+1}^m e_i$. Denoting $\rho = \sum \lambda_i$, we find that the weight $\lambda + \rho$ assumes the form

$$\lambda + \rho = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i e_i \bmod e_1 + e_2 + \ldots + e_m, \tag{2.25}$$

where t_i is the signature of the Young tableau, introduced above. The modular matrix for the group G current algebra at the level k can be written explicitly as [18],

$$S_{\lambda,\mu} = \frac{m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(k+m)^{\frac{m-1}{2}}} \sum_{w \in W} (-1)^w e^{2\pi i w(\lambda+\rho)(\mu+\rho)/(k+g)}, \tag{2.26}$$

where M and M^* stand for the long root and weight lattices, respectively. where W is the Weyl group of G, which for the Lie algebra $SU(m)$ acts as permutations on the e_i, and $g = m$. Substituting the expressions for λ and ρ, eq. (25), we find

$$S_{\lambda,\mu} = C \sum_{p \in S_m} (-1)^p e^{2\pi i \sum_r r_i s_{p(i)}/(k+g)}, \tag{2.27}$$

where r_i and s_i are the signature sequences for the representations λ and μ. This S matrix is identical to eq. (8), where the only difference is that $\sum r_i = \sum s_i$ is required to vanish, in order to describe $SU(m)$ weights. It follows that we can factor out this term to get a product of a $U(1)$ modular matrix times an $SU(m)$ one,

$$S_{r_i;s_i} = \sum_{p \in P} e^{2\pi i \sum_r r_i s_{p(i)}/(k+m)} = e^{\frac{\pi i M_r M_s}{m(k+m)}} S_{\lambda,\mu}, \tag{2.28}$$

where λ and μ are the $SU(m)$ weights with the signatures $r_i - r_1$ and $s_i - s_1$ respectively, and the $U(1)$ charge is given by $M_r = \sum (r_i - i + 1)$. This proves that we get also the correct fusion rules, making use of eq. (4) (or, alternatively, the relation found in ref. [19]). It can be checked that the fusion rules so obtained are precisely those of the $SU(m)_k \times U(1)_{m(k+m)}$ with the extended algebra described above. The Schubert–like calculus, developed for $SU(m)$ in ref. [8], can then be used to derive the full Schubert calculus, eqs. (13,14).

Let us turn now to the potential V. Denote by V_m the function,

$$V_m = \sum q_1^k + q_2^k + \ldots + q_m^k, \tag{2.29}$$

expressed in terms of the symmetric variables $y_r = x_r$, eq. (2). A recursion relation for V follows from the polynomial equation obeyed by q_i (see the appendix to ref. [8]),

$$0 = \prod_{i=1}^{m} (X - q_i) = X^m - y_1 X^{m-1} + y_2 X^{m-2} + \ldots + (-1)^m y_m. \tag{2.30}$$

Multiplying by X^s, and summing over the solutions, q_i, implies the recursion relation,

$$V_{m+s} - y_1 V_{m+s-1} + y_2 V_{m+s-2} + \ldots + (-1)^m y_m V_m = 0. \tag{2.31}$$

clearly, $V_0 = m$, $V_1 = y_1$, $V_2 = y_1^2 - 2y_2$, etc. Thus we can use the relation eq. (31) to compute the potentials. Another relation that holds for V_m is,

$$\frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial V_m}{\partial y_s} = (-1)^{s-1} Z_{m-s}, \tag{2.32}$$

where Z_n denotes, as before the totally symmetric representation,

$$Z_n = [0, 1, 2, \ldots, m-1, m+n]. \tag{2.33}$$

Now, the potential of the theory, eq. (1), can be written as

$$V_{m,k} = V_{k+m+1} - \lambda y_1, \tag{2.34}$$

where $\lambda = (-1)^{m-1}$ is the coupling constant of the perturbation y_1. We shall omit the indices m and k on $V_{m,k}$, where no confusion can arise. The fusion ring is, as usual [8] the ring generated by the y_r, $r = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, along with the relations, $\frac{\partial V}{\partial y_r} = 0$, or it is the Jacobian variety,

$$R \approx \frac{P[y_i]}{(\partial_i V)}. \tag{2.35}$$

Using eq. (32), the relations can be written as,

$$Z_{k+m-r} = \lambda \delta_{r,1} \text{ for } r = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1, \tag{2.36}$$

where the Z_m's are expressed as polynomials in the y_i variables, which can be computed, for instance, using the Jacobi–Trudi, eq. (14). The number of solutions to this set of quasi–homogeneous equations, is the product of the degrees of the equations, divided by the product of the degrees of the generators, where $\deg(y_r) = r$, (see, e.g., [20]

$$N = \prod_{r=1}^{m} \frac{k+m-r}{r}, \tag{2.37}$$

Indeed, this is exactly the correct number of the primary fields as defined by eq. (6).

Let us turn, now, to some examples. Consider the case of $m = 3$, in the notation of eq. (1). The potentials V_m, eq. (29), are readily calculated using eq. (31), $V_0 = 3$, $V_1 = y_1$, $V_2 = y_1^2 - y_2$, $V_3 = y_1^3 - 3y_1y_2 + 3y_3$, $V_4 = y_1^4 - 4y_1^2y_2 + 4y_1y_3 + 2y_2^2$, $V_5 = y_1^5 - 5y_1^3y_2 + 5y_1y_2^2 + 5y_1^2y_3 - 5y_2y_3$, etc. In the case of $k = 1$ we obtain, using the Jacobi–Trudi, eq. (14), the following relations,

$$Z_2 = \begin{vmatrix} y_1 & 1 \\ y_2 & y_1 \end{vmatrix} = y_1^2 - y_2 = 0, \tag{2.38}$$

$$Z_3 = \begin{vmatrix} y_1 & 1 & 0 \\ y_2 & y_1 & 1 \\ y_3 & y_2 & y_1 \end{vmatrix} = y_1^3 - 2y_1y_2 + y_3 = 0, \tag{2.39}$$

$$Z_4 = \begin{vmatrix} y_1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ y_2 & y_1 & 1 & 0 \\ y_3 & y_2 & y_1 & 1 \\ 0 & y_3 & y_2 & y_1 \end{vmatrix} = y_1^4 - 3y_1^2 y_2 + 2y_1 y_3 + y_2^2 = +1. \qquad (2.40)$$

It follows that $y_2 = y_1^2$ (eq. 38), $y_3 = y_1^3$ (eq. 39), and $y_1^4 = 1$ (eq. 40). Thus, we recover the fusion ring[⋆]. of $SU(4)_1$, $R \equiv \frac{P[y_1]}{(y_1^4 - 1)}$. Using eqs. (6,24) we can write the primary fields as polynomials in y_1. We find, $y_1 = \Phi_1^{\lambda_1}$, $y_2 = y_1^2 = \Phi_2^{\lambda_2}$, $y_3 = y_1^3 = \Phi_3^0$, and indeed the relation $y_1 y_3 = \Phi_1^{\lambda_1} \cdot \Phi_3^0 = \Phi_4^{\lambda_1} = \Phi_0^0 = 1$ holds (where we used the external automorphism action, eq. (23)). The central charge is, eq. (12), $c = \frac{3^2-1}{3+1} + 1 = 3$, i.e., the same value as for $SU(4)_1$. We conclude that this theory is equivalent to $SU(4)_1$. For $k = 2$, the calculations are slightly more involved, and are mostly left as an exercise to the reader. The relations in the fusion ring can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} 2y_1 y_2 - y_1^3 &= y_3, \\ y_1^4 - y_2^2 - y_1^2 y_2 &= 0, \\ -3y_1 y_2^2 + 2y_1^3 y_2 + 1 &= 0. \end{aligned} \qquad (2.41)$$

[⋆] Note that the superpotentials V_k^m and V_m^k lead to identical superconformal field theories, that is there is the rank–level duality of exchanging m and k. This follows from the usual duality of the h.s.s. theory, $SU(m+1)_k/SU(m) \times U(1)$ of exchanging m with k [10, 21], which is the $\lambda = 0$ limit. Further, since the duality entails the transposition of the Young tableaux, the perturbation y_1 is duality invariant (as well as any other perturbation which is transposition invariant). Thus, on physical grounds $V_m^k \approx V_k^m$. Alternatively, one may use the duality of the Schubert calculus [15], to prove this from the mathematical viewpoint. (or, alternatively, give a physical proof for this duality.) In particular, $V_{m,k}$ with $k = 1$ is dual to $V_{1,m} = q^{m+2}/(m+2) - q$. Since this is the fusion potential of $SU(m+1)$ it follows that all $k = 1$ examples give the fusion ring of $SU(m+1)_1$. In terms of the corresponding RCFT's, the duality translates to the equivalence relation of the theories $SU(n)_k \approx SU(k)_{-n}$, up to a free boson theory. This is a consequence of the known RCFT relationship $SU(mk)_1 \approx U(1) \times SU(m)_k \times SU(k)_m$, with a particular modular invariant, which follows from the decomposition of nk fermions according to flavor and color current algebras [22, 23, 8, 24]. Inverting $SU(k)_m$ to the other side of this equation, implies the duality of exchanging m and $-k$. In principal, we could have taken $SU(m)_{k/p}$ where p is any integer strange to $m(k+m)$, leading to the same fusion rules, see section (5). However, only the values of $p = \pm 1$ are allowed due to time reversal symmetry of the soliton scattering amplitudes (c.f. section (10)), and these are equivalent under this duality. It follows that the $N = 2$ LG leads to a unique RCFT, as it should, since the scattering amplitudes are built in terms of this particular RCFT braiding matrices (section (7)).

Again, $y_1 = \Phi_1^{\lambda_1}, y_2 = \Phi_2^{\lambda_2}, y_3 = \Phi_3^0$ and there are indeed ten fields, which can be expressed as polynomials using eq. (14). For example, $y_1^2 = \phi_1^{\lambda_1} \cdot \Phi_0^{\lambda_1} = \Phi_2^{2\lambda_1} + \Phi_2^{\lambda_2}$, showing that indeed $\Phi_2^{2\lambda_1} = \begin{vmatrix} y_1 & 1 \\ y_2 & y_1 \end{vmatrix} = y_1^2 - y_2$.

3. Metric and kinks.

The potential V can be taken to be a superpotential of an $N = 2$ scalar field theory (or a Landau-Ginzburg Wess–Zumino model in two dimensions) refs. [25, 26, 27, 28]. The lagrangian of the theory is,

$$\mathcal{L} = \int K(x, \bar{x}) \mathrm{d}^2\theta \, \mathrm{d}^2\bar{\theta} + \int V(x) \mathrm{d}^2\theta + \text{c.c.}, \tag{3.1}$$

where the x_i are now $N = 2$ superfields, V is the superpotential, and K is a suitable kinetic term. The resulting theories are the perturbation by the most relevant operator of the h.s.s. conformal field theories which are the superconformal cosets $SU(m+1)/SU(m) \times U(1)$ [8, 9]. These massive field theories are known to be integrable [11, 12, 13]. Thus we see nicely the connection between the integrability of the potential, and the fact that it is the fusion potential of a rational conformal field theory, a conjecture that was already addressed in ref. [29]. In a precise form, this statement is

Conjecture: Every rational conformal field theory gives rise to an integrable $N = 2$ superconformal field theory, where the chiral algebra of the latter is isomorphic to the fusion ring of the former. Further, any $N = 2$ field theory is integrable if, and only if, it originates from some rational conformal field theory.

Our aim in this paper, and in its sequel [1], is to prove, and establish this statement as a theorem.

The merits of this conjecture is the linking of two hard, yet very different problems, i.e., the classification of rational field theories and the study of two dimensional integrable systems.

The class of examples, discussed in section (2), fits nicely into this conjecture. Indeed, the $N = 2$ theories with the potential eq. (2.1) were the first family of integrable $N = 2$ LG theories to be described. The others were, subsequently, studied by directly substituting the known fusion potentials of $SU(m)_k$ [11, 13] and C_m [29]. Both families of theories have been argued to be integrable. Thus, the '$U(m)$' family, described in section (2), essentially completes the verification of this conjecture for all the known integrable $N = 2$ theories, and almost all the rational conformal field theories for which a fusion potential is known.

There are more detailed aspects of this correspondence, in part noted in ref. [29]. In particular, it was found there, in some examples, that the metric in the moduli space of the $N = 2$ theory is diagonalized by the primary fields, and so this preferred, 'typically rational conformal field theory' basis can be defined entirely in the $N = 2$ context, as the unique basis that diagonalizes the metric. If true, in general, this would allow one to construct a rational conformal field theory by calculating the metric of the corresponding $N = 2$ one, a relatively manageable task. When the rational conformal field theory is known, it can, on the other hand, be used to diagonalize the metric and to make its calculation easier.

Now, the ground states of the $N = 2$ scalar theory, eq. (1) are given by the minima of the scalar potential, $W = \sum_i |\partial_i V|^2$, implying, in turn, that $\partial_i V = 0$. Recall that, these are precisely the points of the fusion variety, x_p, which are labeled by the primary fields p, as explained in section (2). The value of the primary field q at the point x_p is, eq. (2.4), $[q](x_p) = S^\dagger_{p,q}/S_{1,q}$, where S is the matrix of modular transformations. Between some pairs of admissible 'neighboring' vacua p and q, there are some interpolating kinks. The following kink structure has been found [29] in some examples, using a metric calculation, and as is shown in this paper holds in general. The kinks are labeled by some 'fundamental' representations, f_i. The vacua p and q are connected by the kink f_i if, and only if, the fusion coefficient N^q_{p,f_i} does not vanish. We are thus led to a complete scattering picture for the kink theory, where the S matrices are essentially given by the Boltzmann weights of the interaction round the face theory $w\left(\begin{matrix} p & q \\ r & s \end{matrix}\middle| u\right)$, where u is the relative rapidity of the incoming kinks. This S matrix represents the scattering amplitude of $K_{s,p}K_{p,q} \to K_{sr}K_{rq}$, as will be described in detail in the proceeding sections. The Young–Baxter integrability condition for the process is, in turn, the star triangle equation (STE) for this Boltzmann weight, which ensures the integrability of the lattice model, whose partition function is

$$Z = \sum_{\{p_i\}} \prod_{\text{plaq.}} w\left(\begin{matrix} p_i & p_j \\ p_k & p_l \end{matrix}\middle| u\right). \tag{3.2}$$

Importantly, all the known integrable lattice models, which have a second order phase transition point, can be written as fusion IRF theories. Thus, each such model is associated to some unique integrable $N = 2$ supersymmetric theory, along with some rational conformal field theory. Explicit examples are elaborated in section (9). In fact, many constructions of integrable lattice models have been, in part, based on fusion rules of known rational conformal field theories, refs. [7, 6]. Not surprisingly, there is a close relationship between the lattice models and their conformal field theory counterparts. For example, the critical theory itself is a rational conformal field theory, having more or less the same fusion rules. In the case of $G = SU(m)_k$, it was shown [7] to be the coset model $G_k \times G_1/G_{k+1}$. Thus, the conformal field theory figure both in the definition of the theory and in its solution⋆. Further, certain expectations values in the lattice, the so called

---

⋆ The exact relation between the generic fusion IRF model and its multicritical RCFT's is not yet resolved in its entirety, as it behooves us to disentangle the full-fledged, i.e. thermalized, lattice model, which will be addressed in ref. [1]. The following 'empirical' rule seems to hold. The multi–critical points of the model IRF$(\mathcal{O}, x, x)$ are described by the RCFT $\mathcal{O}$ as perturbed by the field x. Note, however, that there are a number of choices for the RCFT $\mathcal{O}$ an x which lead to the same IRF model, and one must choose the correct RCFT which gives the particular multicritical point. For example, the models IRF$(SU(n)_k, [n], [n])$ (see section (8) for more) are described in the ferroelectric regime by the RCFT $G_{k-1} \times G_1/G_k$, where $G = SU(n)$, perturbed by an operator $x = \Phi^{0,0}_{\text{ad}}$ ref. [30]. Since the operator x is a singlet in the $G_{k-1} \times G_1$ theory, it follows that it, essentially, gives back the fusion rules of G_k. which gives back the $SU(n)_k$ fusion rules.

local height probabilities, expressing the probability of a given lattice site to have a certain value, are given directly in terms of the characters of the conformal field theory, and obey the same modular transformation properties, an observation made in ref. [31]. Thus, we see here a triad between rational conformal field theories, integrable superconformal models and integrable lattice models. Our object is to show that these are equivalent physical problems.

Let us examine the family of rational conformal field theories described in section (2) for the purpose of verifying the picture drawn above. This is a relatively straightforward task, as these conformal field theories describe the simplest family of known integrable $N = 2$ supersymmetric theories. In fact, in essentially all other known integrable supersymmetric field theories, this picture was already verified [29]. The first question then, is regarding the metric: is it diagonal in the basis of the primary fields? To see that this is so, let us recall the calculation of the metric refs. [9, 29]. Using a change of variables, we can write the superpotential, eq. (2.1), as

$$V = \lambda(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{q_i^{k+1}}{k+1} - q_i), \tag{3.3}$$

where λ is a coupling constant. For $\lambda \to 0$, the superpotential V describes the h.s.s. theory $SU(m+1)/SU(m) \times U(1)$. For $\lambda = (-1)^m$ it is the fusion potential of the rational conformal field theory $[SU(m)_k \times U(1)_{k(k+m)}]/\sigma$, described in section (2). For any λ, it is an integrable theory. The metric $g_{\lambda,\mu} = \langle\lambda|\mu\rangle$ is defined as the overlap of the Ramond vacua μ with the one obtained on the left by 'spectral flow'. It is the normalization of the chiral fields, as well as the metric in moduli space. The metric obeys the equation [32, 33, 9]

$$\partial(g\partial g^{-1}) + [V, gV^{\dagger}g^{-1}] = 0 \tag{3.4}$$

where $\partial = \partial/\partial\lambda$, and the equation is written in a matrix notation. In ref. [9] it was shown that for this family of potentials, the matrix elements $g_{\lambda,\mu}$ obey an affine Toda equation. We will show that the off diagonal elements vanish in the primary field basis. One computes the solutions using the pullback to the decoupling variables q_i. The Jacobian, for this change of variables from x_i to the q_i is the Vandermonde determinant $D = \prod_{i<j}(q_i - q_j)$. The metric for the potential V, in terms of the q_i, is of the form

$$g_{t_i,n_i} = g(t_i - n_i) = \prod_i e^{L(r_i)}, \tag{3.5}$$

where t_i and n_i label the primary fields, and are the same labels that were used for the $U(m)$ primary fields in eq. (2.6). The functions $L(r_i)$ are the solutions of an $\hat{A}_m$ Toda equation, where the r_i label the specific boundary condition, determined by the behavior of L at the origin, i.e., the metric at the conformal point. The metric in the fusion variety basis is given by the fourier components of $g(n_i - m_i)$,

$$g_{r,s} = e^{2\pi i(t_1 r_1 + t_2 r_2 + \ldots + t_m r_m)/k} e^{-2\pi i(s_1 n_1 + s_2 n_2 + \ldots + s_m n_m)/k} g(n_i - m_i). \tag{3.6}$$

Now, pulling back the metric to the symmetric variables, involves two things: 1) Multiplying by $J(r_i)^* J(s_i)$, where J is the Jacobian for this change of variables, which is identical to the Vandermonde determinant. 2) Anti–symmetrizing with respect to the permutations of the different i's. Thus, we find that the metric in the fusion variety basis of the $U(m)$ theory is

$$g_{r_i,s_i} = J(r_i)^* J(s_i) \sum_{t_i,n_i} \left(\sum_{p\in S_m} (-1)^p e^{2\pi i r_i t_{p(i)}} \right) \left(\sum_{q\in S_m} (-1)^q e^{2\pi i s_i n_{q(i)}} \right) g(t_i - n_i). \tag{3.7}$$

Note, that the Vandermonde is essentially the denominator of the Weyl character formula, while the permutations correspond to the Weyl group. Hence, the transition to the primary field basis is implemented by the matrix $S^\dagger_{r;m}/S_{r;0}$ which is the 'Weyl' character of r_i specialized to the points m_i, eqs. (2.6, 2.27). It follows that we find exactly the orthonormality condition for the Weyl characters, using as a measure the denominator, $D = J$,

$$g_{t_i,n_i} = \sum_{r_i,s_i} \frac{S_{r;t}}{S_{r;0}} \frac{S^{\dagger}_{s;n}}{S_{s;0}} g(r_i; s_i) = \delta_{t_i;n_i} \prod_i e^{L(r_i)}, \tag{3.8}$$

and we proved that the metric is diagonal in the primary fields basis.

In the primary fields basis, $p = [r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_m]$, the equation for the metric assumes the form,

$$\partial(g_p \partial g_p^{-1}) + \sum_i g_{p+e_i} g_p^{-1} - g_p g_{p-e_i}^{-1} = 0, \tag{3.9}$$

where $e_i = [0, 0, \ldots, 1, 0 \ldots, 0]$. Note that the combination that appears in the equation is the multiplication by $V = x \bmod \partial_i V$, according to the Schubert calculus, eq. (2.13). This equation is solved by the product of $\hat{A}_m$ Toda solutions in each of the variables. One still needs to determine the boundary conditions. Unfortunately, the connections between the boundary conditions and the asymptotic behavior of the metric at $x \to \infty$ is not known in general*. However, the result of the calculation when done, would show that for $\lambda \to \infty$ the metric assumes the form (in the fusion variety basis),

$$g_{r,s} = N^s_{r,f_i} e^{-2|\lambda| M_{f_i}}, \tag{3.10}$$

where the f_i are the solitons of the theory, M_{f_i} are their masses, and N^s_{r,f_i} are the fusion coefficients. Since the asymptotic behavior of the metric is dominated by the single soliton transitions, refs. [9, 29], this shows that, indeed, the f_i–soliton connects the r and s vacua if and only if $N^s_{r,f_i} > 0$, in accordance with the precedingly described IRF picture.

$\star$ The problem can be analyzed, as usual, via an isomonodromy problem for a linearized Lax pair representation of the equation, which is mathematically straightforward, but was not done yet. Alternatively, the equation can be solved numerically.

Alternatively, we can study the allowed solitonic transitions of the integrable field theories eq. (2.1) directly. The allowed transitions for this class of potentials were conjectured in refs. [11, 12, 13]. It was shown there that the Bogomolni lower bound for the mass of the solitons interpolating between the x_i and x_j vacua is given by $|V(x_i)-V(x_j)|$, where V is the superpotential. Assuming that the solitons are chiral, implies that this bound is saturated. In this case, we can calculate the masses of the possible solitons in the theory. Specializing to the case of $m = 1$, $V = \frac{q^{m+1}}{m+1} - q$, we find that the classical ground states are given by $q_r = e^{2\pi ir/m}$, and that the mass of the soliton which interpolates the r and s vacua is

$$M_{rs} = |V(q_r) - V(q_s)|, \tag{3.11}$$

and we find for the potential V, in particular, $M_{rs} = \frac{2k}{k+1} \sin[\frac{\pi(r-s)}{k}]$. This is precisely the mass spectrum of the $\hat{A}_m$ S-matrices [34], and it follows that all such transitions are allowed, and that the s soliton mediates between the r and $r + s$ vacua. In other words, the allowed transitions indeed correspond precisely to the fusion rules of the bosonic rational conformal field theory which has V as a fusion potential.

For the potential, eq. (1), with $m > 1$, one can deduce the allowed transitions by making the ansatz that the solitonic masses in the theory are identical to those that appear for $m = 1$. This implies that the vacua $[r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_m]$ and $[n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_m]$ are connected, if and only if, $r_i = n_i$ for all i, except for a unique s, for which $r_s \neq n_s$, and then they are connected by the $t = r_s - n_s$ soliton, whose mass is $M_t = \sin(\pi t/k)$. When one draws the connectivity graph of the allowed vacua and their connecting solitons, the conjectured polytopes of ref. [11] are found, now, reinterpreted as the fusion rules of the corresponding RCFT (for more detail, see section (8), which treats such graphs, in general)

We wish to examine whether this solitonic structure is consistent with the fact that these are fusion theories. Straightforwardly, we find that the lowest soliton,

$t = 1$, implies the transition,

$$p = [r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_m] \to \sum_s [r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_s + 1, \ldots, r_m]. \tag{3.12}$$

which is identical to a fusion by the fundamental field of the rational conformal field theory, $x = q_1 + q_2 + \ldots + q_m$ using the Pieri, eq. (2.13). In other words, the vacua p and q are connected by the fundamental soliton if and only if q appears in the operator product of x and p. This is, precisely, the afore discussed fusion structure of the IRF theories, and is consistent with eq. (10). Indeed the same fusion rules, again, describe the theory, and its solitonic structure. The higher solitons are mediated by the fields in the theory, which are of the form $x_r = q_1^r + q_2^r + \ldots + q_m^r$. In other words, the p and q vacua are connected by the t soliton if and only if q appears in the product of p and x_t. Again this is a fusion structure, albeit, for $r > 1$ the field x_r is not a primary field, but a combination of several ones. We conclude that the general framework drawn in this paper is, indeed, verified for the class of potentials, eq. (2.1). This completes our voyage through the integrable $N = 2$ supersymmetric theories which have been constructed explicitly to date*.

$\star$ There are a number of sporadic examples not covered here. These are the $D - E$ perturbations found in [35], where the A perturbation is the usual Chebishev $SU(2)_k$ one. The RCFT correspondence, drawn here, works perfectly for the D and E cases, as well. It can be shown that all the A-D-E LG potentials are the fusion potentials of some rational conformal theories which are described in [1]. The S matrix of each of the RCFT is, essentially, the eigenvalue matrix of the corresponding Cartan matrix. This is consistent with eq. (2.4) and the observation made in ref. [35] regarding the locations of the vacua of the LG theories. Further, the S matrices of the soliton scattering amplitudes are given by the extension of the braiding matrices, as is discussed, in general, in sections (7-10).

4. New Rational Conformal Field Theories.

Our purpose in this section is to introduce a novel class of rational conformal field theories, closely related to current algebras, and in particular new type of coset conformal field theories. These theories will serve us as a framework in which one can further address the questions raised previously.

Consider the following system of fusion rules:

$$A_1 A_r = A_{r-1} + A_{r+1} \qquad \text{for } 1 \le r \le N, \tag{4.1}$$

with the convention that $A_0 = 1$ and $A_{N+1} = A_N$. The rest of the products are computed by associativity. The case of $N = 1$ corresponds to the fusion rules of $(G_2)_1$. It can be checked that this is a consistent set of fusion rules, where every field has a unique conjugate, which is itself, (i.e., the theory is real), and the fusion rules are fully symmetric when one lowers the index with the conjugation bilinear form. Thus, eq. (1) represents a consistent conformal fusion ring.

Next, we wish to find the table of representations of the fusion algebra (which are all one dimensional), as these correspond to the S matrix. Note the similarity of these fusion rules to those of the $SU(2)$ current algebra; the only modification is in the last condition $A_{N+1} = A_N$ instead of $A_N = 0$. Thus, again, we represent the primary fields as polynomials in $A_1 = 2\cos\phi$ where ϕ is some angle. The polynomials are the same Chebishev polynomials of the second kind, which appear for $SU(2)$, since the recursion relation, eq. (1) is identical to the SU(2) one [8],

$$A_r(2\cos\phi) = \frac{\sin(r+1)\phi}{\sin\phi}. \tag{4.2}$$

The only additional relation is $A_{N+1} = A_N$, which implies

$$\sin[(N+2)\phi] = \sin[(N+1)\phi], \tag{4.3}$$

and is solved to give the points of the fusion variety

$$\phi = \frac{\pi(2r-1)}{2N+3}, \qquad \text{where } r = 1, 2, \ldots, N+1, \tag{4.4}$$

where we excluded the solution $\phi = 0$, since it leads to the vanishing of the denominator, $\sin\phi$. Upon a reordering of the primary fields,

$$m \to 1 + (-1)^m m/2 \bmod (2N+3), \tag{4.5}$$

we find that the S matrix of the theory, which, up to a constant, is a table of the representations, is

$$S_{i,j} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2N+3}} \sin\left[\frac{\pi(2i-1)(2j-1)}{2N+3}\right], \tag{4.6}$$

where $1 \leq i, j \leq N+1$. Evidently, S is a real symmetric matrix, obeying $S^2 = SS^\dagger = 1$, and thus is physically acceptable. We find the matrix T from the consistency relation $(ST)^3 = 1$,

$$T_{i,j} = e^{2\pi i(\Delta_i - c/24)}\delta_{i,j}, \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$\Delta_i = \frac{i(i-2)}{2N+3}, \tag{4.8}$$

is the dimension of the ith primary field. The central charge of the theory is

$$c = \frac{6N+3}{2N+3} - (-1)^N. \tag{4.9}$$

The dimensions are found modulo an integer, while the central charge, c, is found modulo 8. For $N = 1$, we find $c = 14/5$ and $\Delta = 2/5$, agreeing with the well known values for the $(G_2)_1$ current algebra. $N = 0$ implies that c and Δ vanish, the well known values for a theory with only one primary field [19].

Since each of the fields is a Chebishev polynomial in the generating primary field A_1, it follows that the fusion ring is described by $P[x]/(p(x))$, where $p(x)$ generates the ideal of relations in the ring, and where $x = A_1$. The potential of the theory, V, is related to p by $p = \mathrm{d}V/\mathrm{d}x$, and is

$$V(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{q_i^{N+2}}{N+2} - \frac{q_i^{N+1}}{N+1}, \tag{4.10}$$

where $q_1 q_2 = 1$ and $x = q_1 + q_2$.

The potential $V(x)$, eq. (10), is, like all fusion potentials generated by one conformal field, a massive perturbation of the $N = 2$ minimal conformal models. More precisely, if one takes the superpotential of an $N = 2$ LG theory to be $W(x) = \lambda V(x\lambda^{\frac{-1}{N+2}})$, where λ is the coupling constant, then for $\lambda = 1$, the superpotential is identical to the fusion potential, whereas, for $\lambda = 0$, it reduces to the homogeneous part, $W \propto x^{N+2}$, which is the superpotential of the Nth minimal model.

The fusion potential can be written as a difference of Chebishev polynomials of the first kind,

$$V(x) = \frac{T_{N+2}(x)}{N+2} - \frac{T_{N+1}(x)}{N+1}, \tag{4.11}$$

where $T_n(2\cos\phi) = 2\cos(n\phi)$. The Chebishev polynomials are $T_0 = 2$, $T_1 = x$ and obey the recursion relation $xT_n = T_{n+1} + T_{n-1}$, from which they can be readily calculated. For $N = 1$ the fusion potential assumes the form $V(x) = \frac{x^3}{3} - \frac{x^2}{2} - x + 1$. This potential describes a massive perturbation of the $k = 1$ minimal model. By a shift of x, $x \to x + c$ the potential is seen to describe the most relevant perturbation $V = x^3 - \lambda x$, which is equivalent to a particular sine-Gordon theory, a well known integrable model. For $N = 2$, we find the potential $V_2 = \frac{x^4}{4} - \frac{x^3}{3} - x^2 + x + \frac{1}{2}$, which is a perturbation of the second minimal model, and is a theory of one scalar field, along with one fermion field. Similarly, one can calculate the potentials for higher N. The fusion relation is $\frac{\mathrm{d}V}{\mathrm{d}x} = 0$. For $N = 1$, it is $x^2 = x + 1$, the well known fusion rule of $(G_2)_1$.

The class of theories described above affords a generalization to all $SU(N)$, for any $N \geq 2$. To define the theories, it is convenient to start directly with the current algebra $SU(N)_k$, where k and N are mutually strange numbers, $(k, N) = 1$. Recall the external automorphisms of SU(N), used in section (2). It is well known [36, 37, 21] that these are external automorphisms of the fusion ring of G_k, for any G and k,

$$\lambda\sigma(\mu) = \sigma(\lambda)\mu = \sigma(\lambda, \mu), \tag{4.12}$$

for any integrable highest weights λ and μ and for any external automorphism σ. For $SU(N)_k$ where $(k, N) = 1$ all the external automorphisms act without fixed points, i.e., $\sigma(\lambda) = \lambda$ implies $\sigma = 1$. $SU(N)_k$ is the only group which admits no fixed points for a generic k. The level one simply laced groups are the only other such examples. Since σ is an automorphism of the fusion rules, eq. (12), we may consistently identify fields which are related by the action of σ, and define the new fusion ring R/σ. Namely, we define $[\lambda]$ to be the equivalence class of the weight λ modulo the action of σ. We further define the fusion coefficient of such classes by

$$[\lambda] \times [\rho] = \sum_{\mu \bmod \sigma} N^{\mu}_{\lambda,\rho}[\mu], \tag{4.13}$$

where $N^{\mu}_{\lambda,\rho}$ is the fusion coefficient of $SU(N)_k$. This definition is consistent, since σ acts as an external automorphism, eq. (12). Further, the resulting fusion rules are acceptable for a conformal field theory. To establish this, note that for $(k, N) = 1$, the N-ality of $\sigma(\lambda)$ and λ differ by one. Thus, every orbit under σ contains exactly one element of N-ality zero (color singlet) which may be chosen as a representative, denoted by $\hat{\lambda}$. For example, for $SU(2)_2$ there are two orbits represented by 1 (singlet) and 8 (adjoint). Thus, the new fusion rules may be thought of as a restriction of the usual fusion rules to the N-ality singlet sector. It follows, that they represent a fully consistent operator product algebra, where the conjugate of each field is the usual one, $C_{\lambda,\rho} = \delta_{\lambda,\bar{\rho}}$. Using C to lower the index ρ, $N_{\rho\lambda,\mu} = C_{\rho\theta}N^{\theta}_{\lambda\mu}$, we indeed get a fully symmetric three point function $N_{\rho\lambda\mu}$. We conclude that these are acceptable fusion rules.

The S matrix of the theory is given (up to a factor) by the usual S matrix of $SU(N)$, eq. (2.26), restricted to the singlet sector,

$$S_{\lambda,\mu} = \sqrt{N} S^{SU(N)}_{\lambda,\mu}. \tag{4.14}$$

This S matrix is unitary, $SS^\dagger = 1$, obeys $S^2 = C$, and diagonalizes the fusion rules eq. (13). To see this, we use the relation

$$S_{\lambda,\sigma(\rho)} = e^{-2\pi i \Lambda_\sigma \lambda} S_{\lambda,\rho} \qquad (4.15),$$

which is shown by a direct calculation on the S matrix ref. [38]. To prove, for example, the relation with the fusion rules we may compute [19]

$$\sum_t \frac{S_{t,a} S_{t,b} S^\dagger_{t,c}}{S_{t,1}} = \sum_{t,\sigma} \frac{S_{\sigma(t),a} S_{\sigma(t),b} S^\dagger_{\sigma(t),c}}{S_{\sigma(t),1}} = N^c_{a,b}, \tag{4.16}$$

proving that the restricted S matrix eq. (14) diagonalizes the restricted fusion rules. Similarly, one shows that $S^2 = C$ and $SS^\dagger = 1$.

The central charge of the theories is

$$c = \frac{k(N^2-1)}{k+N} - \Theta(k,N) \bmod 8, \tag{4.17}$$

where $\Theta(k,N)$ is an integer defined by the Gauss-type sum,

$$e^{2\pi i \Theta(k,N)/8} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{\pi i n(N-n)/N}. \tag{4.18}$$

The sum, eq. (18), can be computed through the modular properties of the

Dedekind's eta function , and is [39]

$$\Theta(k, N) = 8S(k, 2N) - 4S(k, N), \tag{4.19}$$

where $S(k, N)$ denotes the Dedekind's symbol,

$$S(k, N) = \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} [n/N - 1/2][nk/N - 1/2], \tag{4.20}$$

and where $[x]$ denotes the fractional part of x,

$$[x] = x \bmod 1, \qquad \text{and } -1/2 < [x] \leq 1/2. \tag{4.21}$$

The dimension of the fields is identical to that of $SU(N)_k$, restricted to the singlet sector,

$$\Delta_\lambda = \frac{\lambda(\lambda + 2\rho)}{2(k + g)}, \tag{4.22}$$

where λ is the highest weight, ρ is half the sum of positive roots and $g = N$ is the dual Coxeter number. The matrix T is

$$T_{\lambda,\mu} = e^{2\pi i(\Delta_\lambda - c/24)} \delta_{\lambda,\mu}, \tag{4.23}$$

and obeys the required relation, $(ST)^3 = C$.

To prove the above relations, and also for instructive purposes, it is convenient to describe this class of theories as quotient theories. For $(k, N) = 1$ the action of the external automorphisms is faithful (without fixed points), and thus every weight λ can be written as $\lambda = \sigma^i(\hat{\lambda})$ where σ is the generating external automorphism (associated to the first fundamental weight, λ_1), and where $\hat{\lambda}$ is a singlet under the center (0 N-ality). Using eq. (15), the S matrix for $SU(N)_k$, can be written as

$$S_{\sigma^n(\hat{\lambda}),\sigma^m(\hat{\mu})} = S_{\hat{\lambda},\hat{\mu}} S^k_{n,m}, \tag{4.24}$$

where $S^k_{n,m}$ is the matrix

$$S^k_{n,m} = e^{2\pi iknm/N}. \tag{4.25}$$

The matrix S^k, eq. (25), corresponds to the S matrix of a conformal field theory with the fusion rules of $SU(N)_1$, but which is a kth power of the usual S matrix. Similarly, the dimensions of the fields are

$$\Delta^k_n = \frac{kn(N-n)}{2N} \bmod 1. \tag{4.26}$$

The central charge can be computed from the consistency relation $(ST)^3 = C$, where $C = \delta_{n+m}$, and we find,

$$c = \Theta(k, N) \bmod 8, \tag{4.27}$$

where $\Theta(k, N)$ is given by eq. (19). Clearly, for $k = 1$, we find $c = N - 1$ which is the central charge of $SU(N)_1$. The fusion relations of the theory are independent of k, $[n][m] = [n + m]$. The matrix T is, as usual,

$$T^k_n = e^{2\pi i[kn(N-n)/N - c/24]}. \tag{4.28}$$

It can be checked that all the usual consistency relations hold.

For the matrix T of $SU(N)_k$, we find the same tensor decomposition as for S,

$$T_{\sigma^n(\hat{\lambda})} = T_{\hat{\lambda}} T^k_n. \tag{4.29}$$

Thus, owing to this tensor product structure, it follows immediately that $(ST)^3 = C$, for the restricted theory, as well as giving an alternative proof for all the other relations. In view of it, we may think of the the restricted theory as the quotient ('new coset') model $SU(N)_k/SU(N)_{1/k}$, as the center theory is formally $SU(N)$ at the rational level $1/k$. (See section (5) for more.)

Let us explore a few examples of the resulting fusion rings of the quotient theories $SU(N)_k/SU(N)_{1/k}$. For $k=1$ the theories are trivial, and indeed eqs. (17,22) imply, $c=\Delta=0$. Consider $SU(3)_2$. The only nontrivial product involving the singlet representations is $[8]\times[8]=[1]+[8]$. Denoting $x=[8]$, this becomes the fusion relation $x^2=1+x$, which is the fusion relation of $(G_2)_1$. We conclude that

$$\frac{SU(3)_2}{SU(3)_{1/2}}\approx (G_2)_{-1}, \qquad \frac{SU(2)_3}{SU(2)_{1/3}}\approx (G_2)_1. \tag{4.30}$$

(For the explanation of the notation $(G_2)_{-1}$ see the next section.)

The theories described in this section represent new rational conformal field theories, and the problem of finding realizations for them is addressed in section (6).

5. General new cosets

The class of theories described here affords even a further generalization. Consider the general fusion rules of the current algebra of a group G at the level k. These fusion rules are connected an S matrix [19]. However, the relation is highly ambiguous and a large number of different theories have the exact same fusion rules, but different S and T matrices. Let p be any integer which is strange to $d(k+g)$, $(p,d(k+g))=1$, where g is the dual Coxeter number, and d is the index of M^* in M, that is d is the least integer such that $dM^*\subset M$. (For $SU(N)$ $d=g=N$.) The general S matrix corresponding to the G_k fusion rules is

$$S^{(p)}_{\lambda,\mu}=\left|\frac{M^*}{(k+g)M}\right|^{1/2}\sum_{w\in W}(-1)^w e^{-2\pi i p w(\lambda+\rho)(\mu+\rho)/(k+g)}. \tag{5.1}$$

Note $S^{(1)}_{\lambda,\mu}$ is the usual S matrix of G_k, eq. (2.26), while other values of p correspond to new S matrices. The following relation ensures that the resulting fusion rules are independent of p

$$S^{(p)}_{\lambda,\mu} = s(\mu) S^{(1)}_{\lambda,h(\mu)}, \tag{5.2}$$

where $h(\mu)$ is some permutation of the integrable highest weights at level k, which depends on p, and $s(\mu) = \pm 1$ is some sign. By examining the expression for S, eq. (1), we find that h is defined (uniquely) by

$$h(\mu) + \rho = pw(\mu + \rho) \mod (k+g)M, \tag{5.3}$$

where w is some Weyl element, $s(\mu) = (-1)^w$, and the fact that this relation holds is guaranteed by $(p, d(k+g)) = 1$. It follows that the fusion rules are

$$N^{c(p)}_{a,b} = \sum_t \frac{S_{a,h(t)} S_{b,h(t)} S^\dagger_{c,h(t)}}{S_{0,h(t)}} = \sum_t \frac{S_{a,t} S_{b,t} S^\dagger_{c,t}}{S_{0,t}} = N^{c(1)}_{a,b}, \tag{5.4}$$

and thus do not depend on p. It can be shown that the dimension formula for the primary fields assumes the form,

$$\Delta_\lambda = \frac{p[(\lambda+\rho)^2 - \rho^2]}{2(k+g)} \mod 1. \tag{5.5}$$

and the central charge of the theory is

$$c = \frac{pkD}{k+g} + \Theta(p,k,G) \mod 8, \tag{5.6}$$

where $\Theta(p,k,G)$ is an integer defined by

$$e^{\pi i \Theta(p,k,G)/4} = \left| \frac{M^*}{kM} \right|^{-1/2} \sum_{\lambda \in M^* \bmod kM} e^{-\pi i p \lambda^2 / k}. \tag{5.7}$$

Note that this relation holds for any even lattice, not necessarily one which is a root lattice of some group, and generalizes to any lattice the gauss sums encountered earlier, eq. (4.18), which correspond to $SU(N)_1$.

A straight forward calculation shows that the usual relations for the modular group hold, $(ST)^3 = S^2 = C$, where $C = \delta_{\lambda,\bar{\mu}}$ is the charge conjugation matrix.

The calculation of the generalized gauss sum, eq. (7), (and the proof of this formula) proceeds by observing that this sum is given by specializing the theta function

$$\Theta_M(\tau) = \sum_{\lambda \in M^*} e^{\pi i \lambda^2 \tau}, \tag{5.8}$$

to the value of $\tau = -p/q + i\epsilon$, where ϵ is very small. Up to an irrelevant real factor,

$$e^{\pi i \Theta(p,k,G)/4} = \Theta_M(-\frac{p}{q} + i\epsilon). \tag{5.9}$$

The latter expression may be evaluated using various theta functions identities, relating it to the multiplier system of the η function, which is given, in turn, by the Dedekind symbols, eq. (4.20). For example, in the case of $G = SU(3)$ we find, $\Theta(p, k, G) = \Theta(p, 1, G) = 8S(p, 6) - 4S(p, 3)$. The RCFT $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{p/q}$ was previously discussed in ref. [39].

Let us denote the conformal field theories defined above as $G_{k/p}$, as formally, at least, they correspond to taking the rational level k/p in the definition of the S and T matrices*.

Although for different values of p the theories have the same fusion rules, they are, in fact, different conformal field theories. Such examples are found even within standard conformal field theory, e.g., $(E_7)_1 \approx SU(2)_{-1}$, $(E_6)_1 \approx SU(3)_{-1}$. However, it is a difficult problem to find realizations for the generic conformal field theory $G_{k/p}$.†

$\star$ We are slightly cavalier, in this notation, about the shift of $k \to k + g$, between the bosonic and affine cases. To be precise, $G_{k/p}$ stands for $G_{(k+g)/p}$, in an obvious abuse of notation.

$\dagger$ A possible solution for this stems from the general treatment of the reconstruction 'fantasy' problem, described in the sequel. The braiding matrix of $G_{k/p}$ can be shown to be equal to those of G_k with the simple replacement of $k + g$ by $(k + g)/p$. Thus, as described in sections (7,8,9), a corresponding IRF lattice model can be constructed. A multi-critical point of this lattice model would then realize the full RCFT $G_{k/p}$.

The current algebra–type theories described above, admit a simplification, as bosonic (or $U(1)^n$) theories at fractional levels. A realization for the latter theories can be easily contemplated. Consider a theory of l free bosons propagating on the l-torus specified by the lattice $\sqrt{k}M$, where k is the level, and M is any even lattice of rank l. The vertex operators, which describe the primary fields in the theory, are, $V_p = \exp(i\vec{p}\vec{\phi}/\sqrt{k})$, where $\vec{\phi}$ is a canonical free boson, and $\vec{p}$ is the momenta, which takes its values in $p \in M^* \bmod kM$. The partition function for the block with a given value of p is expressed as a theta function in the lattice,

$$\Theta_p(\tau) = \sum_{\lambda = p \bmod kM} e^{\pi i \lambda^2 \tau / k}, \tag{5.10}$$

from which one derives the modular transformations,

$$S_{p,q} = e^{-2\pi i pq/k}, \tag{5.11}$$

and

$$T_{p,q} = e^{-\pi i l/12} e^{\pi i p^2/k} \delta_{p,q}. \tag{5.12}$$

These transformations are compatible with the relations $S^2 = (ST)^3 = C$ where $C_{p,q} = \delta_{p,-q}$, as well as with the fusion rule

$$V_p \times V_q = V_{p+q}. \tag{5.13}$$

Now, the point is, that all of the above results remain valid if we define k to be any rational number, which is not necessarily an integer, i.e., $k = a/b$ where a and b are two strange integers. Substituting this value in the equations for S and T we find

$$S_{p,q} = e^{-2\pi i a pq/b}, \tag{5.14}$$

and

$$T_{p,q} = e^{-\pi i c/12} e^{\pi i a p^2/b} \delta_{p,q}. \tag{5.15}$$

where the central charge is defined by the same Gauss sum encountered earlier, eq.

(9),

$$c = \Theta(a, b, M) \bmod 8. \tag{5.16}$$

The realization of these bosonic theories, denoted by $M_{a/b}$, is treated in the next section.

6. Realizations

In this section we would like to address the problem of the realization of the conformal data systems described earlier, i.e., the new 'bosonic' systems, the affine theories at fractional levels, and the new quotient type theories, as full fledged rational conformal field theories. As we shall show, these systems are interrelated, and it will be established that given a realization for the 'bosonic' (thereafter referred to as group algebras) systems, the other theories may be realized as well.

Recall the construction of the group algebra systems. One starts from an arbitrary even lattice, M. M is a sublattice of the dual lattice, M^*. The primary fields are labeled by the momenta $\vec{p}$, which are elements of $M^* \bmod kM$, where k is some integral level. The fusion rules assume the usual form, $[\vec{p}] \times [\vec{p}'] = [\vec{p} + \vec{p}']$. Note that the fusion rules form the group algebra based on the abelian group $\frac{M^*}{kM}$.

The S matrix assumes the form,

$$S^{(q)}_{p,p'} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} e^{-2\pi i q p p'/k}, \tag{6.1}$$

where q is an arbitrary integer strange to $|M^*/kM|$, which labels the different conformal systems, denoted by (q, M). For $q = 1$ we recover the usual bosonic systems based on the lattice M. The conformal dimensions and central charges of the group algebra systems are given by eqs. (4.26, 4.27). For notational simplicity, we assume that $k = 1$, without any loss of generality, by redefining the lattice M, $M \to \sqrt{k}M$. Thus, we shall, henceforth implicitly assume that $k = 1$, unless otherwise specified.

The key to realizing the group algebras systems is, that while for $q = 1$ they correspond to free bosons propagating on the lattice M, for $q \neq 1$ they corresponds to free bosons propagating on some other lattice M_q, whose rank is given by the integral central charge of the theory. In other words, we have the equivalence of conformal systems

$$(q, M) \approx (1, M_q). \tag{6.2}$$

For example, $(-1, SU(2)) \approx (1, E_7)$ and $(-1, SU(3)) \approx (1, E_6)$, where we refer to the root lattice by the name of the group. To realize the theory, we construct the appropriate lattice M_q, for each of the pairs (q, M). The lattice M_q needs to have the following properties,

$$\frac{M_q}{M_q^*} \approx \frac{M}{M^*}, \tag{6.3}$$

by a group isomorphism denoted by ϕ, $\phi(\lambda) \in M_q$ for any λ in M (modulo the actions of M_q and M). This insures the correct set of primary fields and their fusion rules. Further, it remains only to demand the dimension formula,

$$\phi(\lambda)^2 = q\lambda^2 \bmod 2Z, \qquad \text{for all } \lambda \in M_q. \tag{6.4}$$

Provided that the lattice M_q obeys the properties eqs. (3,4), it realizes the conformal system (q, M) described above, as a usual bosonic theory on this new lattice. So, for example, $SU(2)_{-1}$ is realized by seven free bosons propagating on the maximal torus of the group E_7.

Note, that we have the equivalence of realizations $(q, M) \approx (qm^2, M)$ for any integer m (strange to $|M^* \bmod M|$). This follows from the map of primary fields $\phi(x) = mx \bmod M$, where the strangeness of m ensures that ϕ is an isomorphism. Consequently, we simply rename the primary fields on the same lattice M. In addition, if r is the index of M, i.e., r is the least positive integer such that $rM^* \subset M$, then q is defined modulo r, since the shift $q \to q + r$ does not change the S matrix, eq. (1). It follows that q is defined modulo the index r, and up to a multiplication by a square modulo r. In particular, for r which is a prime number, this implies that $q = \pm 1$ are the only distinct possibilities.

Now, it is not easy to find, for each such pair (q, M), a lattice M_q obeying eqs. (3,4). However, the abelian nature of the theory, i.e., the fact that all the conformal blocks are one dimensional, very strongly suggests that the theory is a free bosonic one, and so the lattice M_q exists. The construction of each such lattice resembles a well paved mathematical path, not unlike, for example, the construction of the Leech lattice. In particular, using the modular properties of the characters on this lattice, and using the properties of the principal congruence subgroups of the modular group, the characters of the lattice M_q may be fully computed. These, in turn, encode the number of vectors on the lattice of any given length. Together with the fusion rules, this provides enough information to determine the lattice M_q. In what follows, we shall assume that the lattice M_q indeed exists for any pair (q, M), and leave systematic determination of such lattices to further work.

Let us describe now the realizations of the new quotient conformal field theories. Consider the theory

$$U_k \approx SU(N)_k \times SU(N)_{1/q}, \tag{6.5}$$

where $SU(N)_{1/q}$ is realized as explained previously. The primary fields in the theory are labeled by the pairs (λ_1, λ_2), where λ_1 is an integrable highest weight of $SU(N)_k$, and λ_2 is a highest weight of $SU(N)_1$. Alternatively, we may describe the fields of the theory $\Phi^{\lambda_1}_{\lambda_2}$ as the products

$$\Phi^{\lambda_1}_{\lambda_2} = G^{\lambda_1} H^{\lambda_2}, \tag{6.6}$$

where G and H are the corresponding primary fields of $SU(N)_k$ and $SU(N)_{1/q}$ (which are labeled in the same way as those of $SU(N)_1$).

In this theory, consider the diagonal external automorphisms $\tilde{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$, where σ_1 and σ_2 are the generators of the external automorphisms of the two $SU(N)_k$ and $SU(N)_1$. The automorphism $\tilde{\sigma}$ and its powers generate a Z_N group of external automorphisms, which may be described as the operator product with respect to the primary field [38],

$$J_r = G^{k\Lambda^r} H^{\Lambda^r}, \tag{6.7}$$

where Λ^r is the rth fundamental weight, and G^λ stands for the highest weight field λ, along with the weight λ. Similarly G^λ stands for the highest weight field of H. More precisely, we have the operator product relation,

$$J_r(z_1)\Phi^{\lambda_1}_{\lambda_2}(z_2) = \Phi^{\sigma_1(\lambda_1)}_{\sigma_2(\lambda_2)}(z_1 - z_2)^d + \text{h.o.t.}, \tag{6.8}$$

where the h.o.t. are in the same conformal block, and $d = \Delta(\sigma_r(\lambda_r)) + \Delta(\sigma_r(\lambda_2) - \Delta(\lambda_1) - \Delta(\lambda_2)$. The dimensions of the field J_1 (up to an integer) is

$$\Delta_1 = \frac{k(N-1)}{2N} + \frac{q(N-1)}{2N} = \frac{(k+q)(N-1)}{2N} \tag{6.9}$$

(using eqs. (4.22)). Now, note that we can select the value of $q = -k$ (where q is defined modulo N, for odd N, and modulo $2N$, for even N), in which case the dimensions Δ_r all become integers. Thus, for $k = -q$ the fields J_r are candidates for an extended current algebra for the theory, which would include, in addition to J_r, the affine current algebras of $SU(N)_k$ and $SU(N)_1$. We shall denote by $\mathcal{O}$ the infinite dimensional current algebra generated by the moments of J_r, along with the affine Lie algebras. To ensure that $\mathcal{O}$ is a symmetry of the theory, it is enough to require the locality of $J_r(z)$ with respect to all the fields in the theory. From eq. (8), the field $\Phi^{\lambda_1}_{\lambda_2}$ will be local with respect to all the currents J_r if, and only if,

$$c(\lambda_1) + c(\lambda_2) = 0 \bmod N, \tag{6.10}$$

where $c(\lambda) = N\vec{\lambda}\vec{\Lambda}^1$ is the N-ality of λ. Thus, we impose this condition on the fields of the theory, and eliminate from the spectrum all the fields which do not obey eq. (10). This results in an $\mathcal{O}$ symmetric theory. The fields of the theory, $\Phi^{\lambda_1}_{\lambda_2}$, where

$c(\lambda_1) + c(\lambda_2) = 0$, are organized into irreducible highest weight representations of the algebra $\mathcal{O}$, i.e., the extended conformal blocks. Since J_r acts on the field $\Phi^{\lambda_1}_{\lambda_2}$ via the external automorphism $\tilde{\sigma}_r$ eq. (8), the primary fields correspond to the pairs (λ_1, λ_2), for which $c(\lambda_1)+c(\lambda_2) = 0$, modulo the action of $\tilde{\sigma}$. As $\gcd(k, N) = 1$, the automorphism $\tilde{\sigma}$ acts faithfully on the pairs (λ_1, λ_2), and from each conformal bock, we may choose a unique representative by demanding that $c(\lambda_1) = c(\lambda_2) = 0$. In other words, the conformal blocks of the theory are labeled by the N-ality singlets of $SU(N)_k$, which is precisely what we found for the new cosets defined in section (4). The fusion rules of theory U_k are given by

$$\Phi^{\lambda_1}_0 \times \Phi^{\lambda_2}_0 = \sum_{\lambda} N^{\lambda}_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2} \Phi^{\lambda}_0, \tag{6.11}$$

where we used the conservation of N-ality, $c(\lambda) = c(\lambda_1) + c(\lambda_2)$. $N^{\lambda}_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}$ are the fusion coefficients of $SU(N)_k$, i.e., the fusion rules are simply those of $SU(N)$ restricted to the N-ality singlet sector. Again, these are identical to the fusion rules of the new cosets described earlier, eq. (4.13). Finally the dimensions and central charges are computed using those of each of the component theories, $SU(N)_k$ and $SU(N)_1$, and are found to be

$$\Delta^{\lambda_1}_{\lambda_2} = \frac{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 + \rho)}{k + N} + \frac{q\lambda_2(\lambda_2 + \rho)}{N + 1} \mod 1, \tag{6.12}$$

$$c = \frac{k(N^2 - 1)}{k + N} - \Theta(k, N) \mod 8. \tag{6.13}$$

which, again, are the dimensions and central charges of the new cosets. We conclude that the theories U_k are full fledged conformal field theories which realize the new quotient systems $SU(N)_k/SU(N)_{1/k}$.

It is straightforward, now, to deduce the character formula, or the one loop partition functions, of the theory U_k, by adding up products of characters from each of the ingredient conformal field theories,

$$\chi^{\lambda_1}_{\lambda_2}(\tau) = \mathrm{ch}(\Phi^{\lambda_1}_{\lambda_2})(\tau) = \sum_{n \bmod N} \chi^{\sigma^n(\lambda_1)}_{(k)}(\tau)\chi^{\sigma^n(\lambda_2)}_{(-1/k)}(\tau), \tag{6.14}$$

where $\chi^{\lambda}_{(m)}(\tau)$ stands for the $\widehat{\mathrm{SU}}(N)_m$ character of the representation with the highest weight λ, where τ is the toroidal modulo, and the characters of $SU(N)_{(-1/k)}$ are taken as the characters of the lattice M which realizes them, as explained earlier. The 0-point function on the torus is then seen to be

$$Z(\tau) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \\ c(\lambda)=0}} \chi^{\lambda}_{0}(\tau)^* \chi^{\lambda}_{0}(\tau), \tag{6.15}$$

and is modular invariant, as is seen from the unitarity of the S matrix, eq. (4.14).

Other, non–diagonal invariants are obtained from any invariant of $SU(N)_k$. The partition function then becomes

$$Z(\tau) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda,\bar{\lambda} \\ c(\lambda)=c(\bar{\lambda})=0}} N_{\lambda,\bar{\lambda}} \chi_{\lambda}(\tau)\chi_{\bar{\lambda}}(\tau)^*, \tag{6.16}$$

where $N_{\lambda,\bar{\lambda}}$ is any invariant of $SU(N)$ which obeys $c(\lambda) = c(\bar{\lambda})$. (For a prime N, all the $SU(N)$ invariants are of this form, up to conjugation of λ.) This completes the classification of modular invariants for the theories, as they are all of the form eq. (16).

Before proceeding, let us discuss in some detail the case where N is a prime number. As was mentioned earlier, the realizations of $SU(N)_{1/p}$ and $SU(N)_{1/q}$ are the same conformal field theory, provided that $p = m^2 q \bmod sN$ where $s = 2$, for an even N, $s = 1$, for an odd N, where m is an arbitrary integer. For N which is prime (such that $N > 2$; for $N = 2$, substitute, instead in the sequel, $N = 4$) it is well known, that there are exactly two possibilities for each integer p modulo N, $p = m^2 \bmod N$ or $p = -m^2 \bmod N$ for some m (since Z_N is a finite field this follows from the the basic theorem of algebra on solutions of polynomial equations over a finite field, see, for example, ref. [40]). More succinctly put, we may assume, that

$$q \to \left(\frac{q}{N}\right) = \pm 1, \tag{6.17}$$

where $\left(\frac{q}{N}\right)$ is the Legendre symbol defined as

$$\left(\frac{q}{N}\right) = \begin{cases} +1 & q = m^2 \bmod N, \\ -1 & q = -m^2 \bmod N. \end{cases} \tag{6.18}$$

The theory with $q = \pm m^2 \bmod N$ is realized by making the substitution of the fundmental weight λ_{mr} instead of the fundamental weight λ_r, in the theory $SU(N)_{\pm 1}$. In this case the extended current algebra is generated by the current $J_1 = G^{\Lambda^1} H^{\Lambda^m}$ where H is the corresponding primary field of $SU(N)_{\pm 1}$, which has the dimension $(\bmod Z)$,

$$\Delta_1 = \frac{k(N-1)}{2N} \pm \frac{m(N-m)}{2N}, \tag{6.19}$$

which is an integer.

The theory with $q = 1$ can be realized by the usual $SU(N)_1$ current algebra, while the theory with $q = -1$ is realized by its complex conjugate theory, which is a theory of $1 - N \bmod 8$ free bosons propagating on some lattice M, such that $M^* \times SU(N)_1^*$ contains an even self dual lattice of the same rank[⋆] For example, for $SU(2)$ we may choose the root lattice of E_7 and for $SU(3)$ we may choose the root lattice of E_6. This utilizes the well known relations of conformal field theory,

$$E_8 \approx SU(2)_1 \times (E_7)_1 \approx SU(3)_1 \times (E_6)_1 \tag{6.20}$$

(for a particular choice of modular invariants), which shows that the modular transformations of E_6 (E_7) are the complex conjugate of those of $SU(3)$ ($SU(2)$),

---

[⋆] For $SU(N)_{-k}$ it is not hard to find realizations for any N and k, using the decomposition of Nk fermions into color and flavor (see the footnote after eq. (2.40)). It follows that $SU(N)_k \approx [SU(k)_{-N} \times SU(kN)_1$, with a particular modular invariant.

since E_8 is modular invariant (as its root lattice is even and self dual), implying that indeed $SU(2)_{-1} \approx (E_7)_1$ and $SU(3)_{-1} \approx (E_6)_1$.

Now, since $\Theta(\pm 1, N) = \pm(N-1) \bmod 8$, it follows that the central charge of U_k for a prime N is

$$c = \frac{k(N^2-1)}{k+N} - \left(\frac{k}{N}\right)(N-1), \tag{6.21}$$

where $\left(\frac{k}{N}\right) = \pm 1$ is the Legendre symbol, eq. (18). In the case of $SU(2)$ we find the two subfamilies of theories, $SU(2)_k \times SU(2)_1$ for $k = -1 \bmod 4$ and $c = \frac{3k}{k+2} + 1$, and $SU(2)_k \times (E_7)_1$ for $k = 1 \bmod 4$ and $c = \frac{3k}{k+2} + 7$. In the case of $SU(3)$ the two sequences are, $SU(3)_k \times SU(3)_1$ for $k = 2 \bmod 3$ with the central charge $c = \frac{8k}{k+3} + 2$, and the second sequence $SU(3)_k \times (E_6)_1$, for $k = 1 \bmod 3$, with the central charge $c = \frac{8k}{k+3} + 6$. All theories are defined with the aforementioned extended algebras and the restriction on the fields. For $k = 1$, any N, the theories are always trivial, $c = 0$ mod 8, while the $k = 2$ case of $SU(2)$ is equivalent to $(G_2)_1$ and $SU(3)$ is equivalent to the conjugate theory $(G_2)_{-1}$. Evidently, these are full fledged conformal field theories, related to current algebras.

Let us return now to the general case. Owing to the structure of the theory (up to the restriction on the fields) as a product of current algebras,

$$\Phi^{\lambda_1}_{\lambda_2}(z) = G^{\lambda_1}(z) H^{\lambda_2}(z), \tag{6.22}$$

where $G^{\lambda_1}(z)$ is the corresponding field in $SU(N)_k$, and similarly H is the appropriate bosonic operator, the correlation functions on the sphere are immediately calculated to be,

$$\langle \prod_i \Phi^{\lambda_1^i, \nu^i}_{\lambda_2^i, \mu^i}(z_i) \rangle = \langle \prod_i G^{\lambda_1^i}_{\mu^i}(z_i) \rangle \langle \prod_i H^{\lambda_2^i}_{\nu^i}(z_i) \rangle, \tag{6.23}$$

where we have reinserted the 'magnetic' quantum numbers μ and ν which are weights in the representations of the corresponding **affine** Lie algebras $SU(N)_k$

and $SU(N)_1$, and which label the different fields in the corresponding conformal blocks[†]. Since the N-ality is conserved in each of the component theories, there is an exact correspondence of the conformal blocks in the intermediate channels, and no 'wrong' cross products, which ensures this relation on the sphere. Note, that for higher genus this relation is no longer valid, as we have separate fields flowing in the loops, and in particular, the character formula eq. (14), which corresponds to the toroidal 0-point function, is not of this form.

As the foregoing discussion above was slightly abstract, it is useful to illustrate one example in full detail. Consider, then, the theory $(G_2)_1 \approx SU(2)_2 \times SU(2)_1$ (modulo the extended algebra). This example is closely related to the quotient relation $SU(2)_1 = \frac{(G_2)_1}{SU(2)_3}$, which is a usual coset theory (where $SU(2)_3$ is the algebra generated by the short simple root of G_2). According to the previous discussion, the extended algebra $\mathcal{O}$ is generated by the dimension one currents: 1) $J_a(z)$ which are the three currents of $SU(2)_3$. 2) $K_a(z)$ which are the currents of $SU(2)_1$. (Here $a = 3, +, -$, are the usual magnetic numbers.) 3) The fields $G_i^{3/2} H_j^{1/2}$, where 3/2 and 1/2 are the isospin, and $i = \pm 3/2$, $\pm 1/2$, and $j = \pm 1/2$ are the magnetic numbers. Counting, we find 14 currents of dimension one, which is precisely the dimension of the Lie algebra G_2. To see that these currents indeed obey the correct operator product relations for the affine algebra $(\hat{G}_2)_1$, we may use a bosonization technique. We express the $SU(2)_1$ fields as

$$\begin{aligned} K_3(z) &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \partial\rho(z), \qquad K_\pm(z) = {:}e^{\pm i\sqrt{2}\rho(z)}{:}, \\ H^{1/2}_{\pm 1/2}(z) &= e^{\pm \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\rho(z)}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.24}$$

[†] Actually, we need to put in the right moving part, which depend on $\bar{z}$, for the full description of the theory. According to eq. (15), the torus partition function, the right moving λ's are the same as the left moving ones, where as right moving μ's and ν's are arbitrary. Alternatively, eq. (23) may be interpreted in the language of conformal blocks (see sect. (7)). Since H has only one conformal block per channel, this equation holds for each conformal block separately. See eq. (36) for the description of the general situation.

and the $SU(2)_3$ fields as,

$$\begin{aligned} J_3(z) &= \frac{i\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{2}}\partial\phi(z) \qquad J_\pm(z) = :e^{\pm i\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}}\phi(z)}:\psi^0_{\pm 2}(z) \\ G^{3/2}_r(z) &= :e^{\frac{ir\phi(z)}{\sqrt{6}}}:\psi^3_{2r}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

and so

$$G^{3/2}_r(z)H^{1/2}_t(z) = \psi^3_{2r}(z):e^{\frac{2ir}{\sqrt{6}}\phi(z)+\frac{2it}{\sqrt{2}}\rho(z)}:,$$

where $\psi^0_{\pm 2}(z)$, $\psi^3_{\pm 1}$ and $\psi^3_{\pm 3} = 1$ denote the corresponding parafermionic fields (for explanation and notation see refs. [41, 42]), where $\phi(z)$ and $\rho(z)$ are canonical free bosons, and where ':' stands for the usual normal ordering. The fields $\psi^0_2 = \psi^3_{-1}$ and $\psi^0_{-2} = \psi^3_1$ correspond to the critical three states Pott's model, and have the dimension $\Delta = \frac{2}{3}$, [41, 42]. The entire content of eqs. (24,25) may be summarized in the relation

$$O(z) = S(z)e^{i\vec{m}\vec{\theta}(z)}, \tag{6.26}$$

where $O(z)$ is any of the twelve currents not in the Cartan subalgebra (which is generated by J_3 and K_3), $\vec{\theta}(z) = (\phi(z), \rho(z))$ is a vector boson, $\vec{m}$ is a root lattice of the Lie algebra G_2, and $S(z) = 1$ for a long root, and to a parafermion of the dimension $\frac{2}{3}$, for a short root. Recall from ref. [37] that this is precisely the vertex operator construction of the current algebra $(G_2)_1$, and thus we have established that $\mathcal{O} \approx (G_2)_1$. Finally, there are exactly seven fields of dimension $\frac{2}{5}$, the 4-plet $\Phi^{3/2}_{1/2} = G^{3/2}H^{1/2}$ and the triplet $\Phi^1_0 = G^1$, in the notation of eq. (22). Using the same bosonization and vertex operator construction [37], it follows that this is the representation 7 of $(G_2)_1$. It is left as an exercise to verify that these fields indeed give the correct bosonization of the 7 representation of $(G_2)_1$, as described in ref. [37].

The entire foregoing construction of the new quotient theories can be substantially generalized. Consider the theory,

$$U \approx G_{k_1} \times G_{k_2} \times \ldots \times G_{k_r}, \tag{6.27}$$

where G is any Lie algebra, and the k_i are the levels which are taken to be arbitrary rational numbers. For k which is not a positive integer, G_k stands for the realizations of the affine theories at a fractional level, see section (5). The primary fields in the theory are

$$\Phi^{\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_r}(z) = \prod_i G^{\lambda_i}(z), \tag{6.28}$$

where λ_i are highest integrable weights of the affine Lie algebra $\hat{G}$ at the level q_i where $k_i = q_i/p_i$ and $\gcd(p_i, q_i) = 1$, Now consider the primary field

$$J_\Lambda(z) = \prod_i G^{q_i\Lambda}(z), \tag{6.29}$$

where Λ is a cominimal fundamental weight of G, i.e., $\Lambda\theta = 1$, where θ is the highest root. The field J_Λ is a product of primary fields in each of the current algebras. According to the fusion rules, eq. (4.12), the field J_Λ acts on the primary fields of the theory as the external automorphism,

$$J_1 \times \Phi^{\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_r} = \Phi^{\sigma(\lambda_1),\sigma(\lambda_2),\ldots,\sigma(\lambda_r)}, \tag{6.30}$$

where σ is the external automorphism of $\hat{G}$ associated to the cominimal weight Λ. The dimension of the field J_Λ is computed from eq. (4.22),

$$\Delta_\Lambda = \frac{\Lambda^2}{2} \sum k_i, \tag{6.31}$$

and is an integer provided that $\sum k_i = d$, where d is any integer such that $dM^* \subset M$. We shall henceforth assume that this is the case. Then, $J_\Lambda(z)$, for all the cominimal weights Λ, are taken to be an extended currents of the theory. The fusion rules of G imply that the currents J_Λ, where Λ is any of the cominimal weights, generate a closed operator product algebra, where the fusion rules form a group algebra, with a group which is isomorphic to the center of G. The operator products of the currents J_Λ with the rest of the fields follow from the fusion rules eq. (4.12), and are

$$J_s(z_1)\Phi^{\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_r}(z) = \sum_d (z_1 - z)^{\delta+d} O_d(z), \tag{6.32}$$

where d is any integer, $O_d(z)$ is some field in the conformal block $\Phi^{\sigma_s(\lambda_1)_r,\sigma_s(\lambda_2),\ldots,\sigma_s(\lambda_r)}$, and the dimension δ is

$$\delta = \sum_i \Delta(\lambda_i) - \Delta(\sigma(\lambda_i)), \tag{6.33}$$

as computed from eq. (4.22). It follows that the currents J_Λ have an abelian ($U(1)$) monodromy with respect to all the fields in the theory and a well defined mutual semi–locality exponent which is equal to δ. In particular, we may consistently eliminate from the theory all the fields for which δ is not an integer, keeping only fields which are local with respect to all the currents J_Λ. The theory, so obtained, has an extended current algebra, $\mathcal{O}$, which is generated by the affine currents of $G \times G \times \ldots \times G$, along with the extended currents, J_Λ. The blocks of the theory, organized with respect to this extended current algebra, correspond to the classes of admissible (i.e., integral δ, eq. (33), for all the cominimal weights) r-plets $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r)$, modulo the action of $\tilde{\sigma}$. The characters of the theory are

$$\chi^{\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_r} = \sum_{\sigma\in C} \prod_i \chi_i^{\sigma(\lambda_i)}(\tau), \tag{6.34}$$

where $\chi_i^\lambda(\tau)$ stands for the character of of the representation λ_i of the theory G_{k_i}, in the appropriate realization. The modular invariant toroidal partition function of the theory is

$$Z = \sum_{\lambda_i,\bar{\lambda}_i} \prod_i N^{(i)}_{\lambda_i,\bar{\lambda}_i} \chi^{\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_r}(\bar{\tau}) \chi^{\bar{\lambda}_1,\bar{\lambda}_2,\ldots,\bar{\lambda}_r}(\tau)^*, \tag{6.35}$$

where the sum is over the admissible r-plets $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r)$, (i.e., δ =integer), taking exactly one representative from each of the cosets modulo the action of $\tilde{\sigma}$. $N^{(i)}_{\lambda,\bar{\lambda}}$ are arbitrary modular invariants for each of the sub-theories G_i, such that $c(\lambda_i) = c(\bar{\lambda}_i)$, where $c(\lambda)$ is the value of λ under the center of G, or $c(\lambda) = \lambda \bmod M_l$, where M_l is the long root lattice. The diagonal modular invariant corresponds to $N^{(i)}_{\lambda_i,\bar{\lambda}_i} = \delta_{\lambda_i,\bar{\lambda}_i}$, when inserted into eq. (35).

We can still generalize this construction in a number of ways.

1) We may let C stand for any subgroup of the center, taking only a subalgebra of the currents for the extended algebra.

2) We may choose different groups instead of G in eq. (27), and taking C to be any subgroup of a center of the product group $\otimes_i G_i$, which is $\oplus_i C_i$, where C_i is the center of G_i. In short, $C \subset \oplus C_i$ can be any subgroup. For the extended currents we take $J = \prod_i J_{\Lambda_i}$, where Λ_i is a cominimal weight of G_i, and the r-plets $(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ldots, \Lambda_r)$ go over all elements of C.

3) Note that there are no limitations on the levels k_i, eq. (27), which may be any rational numbers. In particular, the construction carries through, even, when there are fixed points in the action of σ.

The construction above applies to the cases (1–3), mutatis mutandis, in a straightforward manner. It is left as an exercise for the reader to verify this. Albeit, there is one difference when two or more of the sub–theories are non–bosonic. This is due to the fact that there are more than one conformal blocks in each of the sub–theories, and eq. (23) needs to be modified to,

$$\mathcal{F}^{\Phi}_p(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_r) = \sum_{p_i} d^p_{p_1,p_2,\ldots,p_r} \prod_i \mathcal{F}^i_{p_i}(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_r), \tag{6.36}$$

where $\mathcal{F}^i_p(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_r)$ is the pth conformal block of the correlation function $\langle \prod_s G_i^{\lambda_s}(z_s) \rangle$ in the G_i theory, and $d^p_{p_1,p_2,\ldots,p_r}$ are some coefficients.

We may actually take any of the G_i to be a free boson theory, or a vector boson $\vec{\phi}$ propagating on the lattice M at the level k. The primary fields, λ, are given by elements of M^*/kM. The external automorphisms of the bosonic theory are shifts on the lattice, $\sigma_a(\lambda) = \lambda + a$, where λ is any primary field, and a is any element of M^*/kM. Clearly, the external automorphisms form the group M^*/kM, which may be thought of as the center. For the product theory, $\otimes_i G^i_{k_i} \times B$, where B stands for the bosonic theory, we find the center group $C = \oplus_i C_i \oplus \frac{M}{kM^*}$. We may take any subgroup, H, of this center, $H \subset C$. The current associated to the element $h = (h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_r, \vec{a}) \in H$, where h_i is a cominimal weight of G_i, and $\vec{a}$ is some shift in M^*/kM, is $J_h = \prod_i J_{h_i} \exp(i\vec{a}\vec{\phi}/\sqrt{k})$, where J_{h_i} are the primary fields $G_i^{q_i h_i}$ associated to the cominimal weight h_i. The fact that H is a subgroup, implies that the currents J_h, $h \in H$, form a closed operator product algebra. The rest of the discussion follows as in the non–abelian case, with the appropriate obvious modification of the mutual semi–locality exponent δ, eq. (32). Note that the conformal field theories described in sect. (2) are precisely $SU(m)_k \times U(1)_{m(m+k)}$, where the $U(1)$ piece corresponds to one free boson propagating on the root lattice of $SU(2)$ at the level $m(k+m)$. The automorphism $\tilde{\sigma}$ is taken, in this case, to be $\tilde{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_{k+m})$, where σ_1 is the fundamental weight automorphism of $SU(m)$, and σ_{k+m} is the shift by $k+m$ on the lattice. Note, that $\tilde{\sigma}$ generates a Z_m group H, which is a subgroup of the center group, $C \approx Z_m \times Z_{m(k+m)}$, i.e., $H \subset G$. The discussion in sect. (2) may be considered as an example of the above general construction.

The realizations presented here describe all the known rational conformal systems (except, perhaps, some rational bosonic orbifolds) along with many new ones. In particular, the usual coset models G/H [41−46, 37] can be described as $G_k \times H_{-k}$ along the lines above. Similarly, theories corresponding to the quotient theories G/C where C is a subgroup of the center, are described by the case of $r = 1$. It is intriguing to note that the form, eq. (27), is particularly suitable for a description of the theories as Chern-Simons models, which are based on the group G_i and the levels k_i. This is in line with the ideas of ref. [39] which describes $SU(2)_k$, k rational from a Chern–Simons approach, and with those of refs. [47, 48] which attempt to elucidate cosets models in this language.

7. Fusion IRF

In this section we will give the general formulae for the Boltzmann weights of solvable interaction round the face (IRF) lattice models, which will be constructed out of the data of the general rational conformal field theory (RCFT) and in particular the braiding relations on the sphere. (For reviews on braiding relations in RCFT, see, for example, refs. [49, 50, 51].) More precisely, as we will show, at the extreme UV limit, the IRF models Boltzmann weights give a representation of the braid group, which coincides with the conformal braiding algebra. This is precisely the conformal limit of integrable massive soliton systems. In particular, the kink operators exchange algebra reduces to the chiral vertex operators exchange algebra. Thus, we are able to recover the full S matrix or Boltzmann weight for any rapidity, making use of the algebraic properties of the braiding matrices, i.e., the n-CB algebra defined in the sequel, eq. (9.2).

The general fusion IRF model is defined as follows. Consider a square lattice (fig. 7.1) whose vortices are labeled by the primary fields of some rational conformal field theory. Further, restrict the admissible configurations by the condition that $N_{xb}^{a} > 0$, where x is some fixed fundamental primary field, N_{xb}^{a} is the fusion coefficient, and where a and b label the two vertices on the same link. The partition function of the theory is then defined as

$$Z = \sum_{\text{configurations}} \prod_{\text{faces}} w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right), \tag{7.1}$$

where $w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right)$ is the face Boltzmann weight, which vanishes unless the state primary fields a, b, c and d, which are defined on the vertices, (fig. 7.1), obey the admissibility condition. Here, u is the spectral parameter, which labels a continuous parameter family of IRF models (it is not to be confused with temperature and other relevant parameters, which are implicit in w). Alternatively, we shall use the notation

$$w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) = \overset{a}{\underset{d}{c\Diamond b}}. \tag{7.2}$$

The key to the solvability of the models is in the fact that the transfer matrices commute for different values of the spectral parameter u. The mathematical condition ensuring this is the star triangle equation (STE) [2],

$$\sum_c w\left(\begin{matrix} b & d \\ a & c \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) w\left(\begin{matrix} a & c \\ g & f \end{matrix}\middle| u+v\right) w\left(\begin{matrix} c & d \\ f & e \end{matrix}\middle| v\right) = \tag{7.3}$$
$$\sum_c w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ g & c \end{matrix}\middle| v\right) w\left(\begin{matrix} b & d \\ c & e \end{matrix}\middle| u+v\right) w\left(\begin{matrix} c & e \\ g & f \end{matrix}\middle| u\right),$$

which is depicted in fig. (7.2). There are three types of solutions to the STE relation, eq. (3), elliptic, trigonometric and constant. We shall concentrate here mainly on the trigonometric case which is the one relevant for soliton systems. The different types of solutions are specializations of each other, expressing different critical limits, but the converse (i.e., how to construct an elliptic solution from a trigonometric one and a trigonometric solution from a constant one) is not generally obvious. Actually, for subsequent use, it is convenient to introduce a slightly more general notion of a fusion IRF model, where for the horizontal links, we allow one primary field h (fixed) and for the vertical links another fixed primary field, v. The admissibility condition then becomes,

$$N_{hb}^{a} N_{vd}^{b} N_{hd}^{c} N_{vc}^{a} > 0, \tag{7.4}$$

for the face defined in eq. (2). Every pair of primary fields, v and h, will denote a different IRF model based on the same RCFT. The STE relation stays essentially the same, having changed only the admissibility condition[⋆]. In the sequel, we shall exhibit solutions for the STE for all possible pairs, h and v.

[⋆] See eq. (10.7) for the explicit form of the modified STE.

It is more convenient to rewrite the STE in an index free notation, using face transfer matrices, fig. (7.3). The states on the diagonal, fig. (3), are denoted by $|a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\rangle$, where the a_i are the heights, i.e., different primary fields. The face transfer matrix, $X_i(u)$, is defined through its matrix elements

$$\langle a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_i, \ldots, a_n | X_i(u) | a_1, a_2, \ldots, a'_i, \ldots, a_n \rangle = w \left(\begin{matrix} a_{i-1} & a'_i \\ a_i & a_{i+1} \end{matrix} \middle| u \right). \quad (7.5)$$

The STE is equivalent to the fact that the face transfer matrices, $X_i(u)$, obey the Young Baxter (matrix) equation (YBE),

$$X_i(u) X_{i+1}(u+v) X_i(v) = X_{i+1}(v) X_i(u+v) X_{i+1}(u). \quad (7.6)$$

$$X_i(u) X_j(v) = X_j(v) X_i(u), \qquad \text{for } |\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{j}| \geq 2. \quad (7.7)$$

Now, we may consider as a special limit of eqs. (6,7) the case where all the spectral parameters go to infinity (henceforth, termed the ultra–violet (UV) limit), $u, v \to i\infty$. In this case, the YBE assumes the form,

$$X_i X_{i+1} X_i = X_{i+1} X_i X_{i+1}, \quad (7.8)$$

where X_i is the limit,

$$X_i = \lim_{u \to i\infty} f(u) X_i(u), \quad (7.9)$$

and where $f(u)$ is some irrelevant function ensuring a finite limit. Another limit which gives the braid relation is the infra-red (IR) limit, $u = v = 0$. We will assume that $X_i(0) \propto 1_i$, the trivial solution, (the regularity condition). As will be discussed in section (10), this condition expresses the fact that the corresponding soliton system has no scattering at zero rapidity. The relations eq. (8), along with eq. (9), form the so called braid group. Denote by σ_i the braiding of the i and

$i+1$ strands, fig. (7.4). It is well known that the braiding generators σ_i obey the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i\sigma_{i+1}\sigma_i &= \sigma_{i+1}\sigma_i\sigma_{i+1}, \\ \sigma_i\sigma_j &= \sigma_j\sigma_i, \qquad \text{for } |i-j| \geq 2, \end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

and that there are no other relations (i.e., these are the defining relations for the group). We conclude that the $X_i(u)$ form a representation of the braid group at the extreme UV and IR limits, eqs. (8,9). On the sphere (S^2) the braid group enjoys the additional relation

$$\sigma_1\sigma_2, \ldots \sigma_{n-2}\sigma_{n-1}^2\sigma_{n-2}\ldots\sigma_1\ldots\sigma_1 = 1, \tag{7.11}$$

which is depicted in fig. (7.5), and is obvious by undoing the braid around the north pole. As we shall see, the X_i form a projective representation of the braid group on the sphere.

Let us turn now to rational conformal field theory. Let $\psi_i(z,\bar{z})$ denote some primary fields. Consider the correlation function,

$$\langle\prod_i \psi_i(z_i,\bar{z}_i)\rangle = \sum_{p,q} D_{p,q}\mathcal{F}_p(z_1,z_2,\ldots,z_n)^*\mathcal{F}_q(z_1,z_2,\ldots,z_n), \tag{7.12}$$

where p and q label the different conformal blocks, and D is some matrix of coefficients, which counts the different blocks appearing in the correlation functions. $\mathcal{F}_q(z_1,z_2,\ldots,z_n)$ are holomorphic function (more precisely, holomorphic sections of the conformal blocks vector bundle) in each of the z_i, and can be depicted pictorially by tree diagrams where the external legs are the ψ_i, and different blocks correspond to different intermediate fields. Different presentations of the blocks must give the same physical correlation function, which implies that the different presentations are the same up to a linear transformation on the blocks. In particular, the four point blocks, $\mathcal{F}_p(z_1,z_2,z_3,z_4)$, are labeled by an intermediate primary field p such that $N_{pk}^i = N_{pl}^j = 1$, where N is the fusion coefficient, fig. (7.6). (In case that $N = N_{ij}^p N_{pkl} \geq 2$, the block is labeled by the pair p, a where $1 \leq a \leq N$.)

It follows that

$$\mathcal{F}_p(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) = \sum_{p'} C_{pp'} \begin{bmatrix} j & k \\ i & l \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{p'}(z_1, z_3, z_2, z_4). \tag{7.13}$$

where i, j, k and l label the four primary fields in the correlation function, and C is the conformal braiding matrix, fig. (7.7). The braiding matrix C obeys the hexagon identity,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_c C_{i\,c} \begin{bmatrix} a & j \\ b & p \end{bmatrix} C_{p\,d} \begin{bmatrix} a & k \\ c & l \end{bmatrix} C_{c\,c'} \begin{bmatrix} j & k \\ b & d \end{bmatrix} = \\ &\qquad\qquad \sum_{p'} C_{p\,p'} \begin{bmatrix} j & k \\ i & l \end{bmatrix} C_{i\,i'} \begin{bmatrix} a & k \\ b & p' \end{bmatrix} C_{p'\,d} \begin{bmatrix} a & j \\ c' & l \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.14}$$

An index free notation for the braiding operation is obtained with the aid of chiral vertex operators [52]. Define the operator $\Phi^j_{ik}(z)$, where j, i and k label the different primary fields, to be the map of Hilbert spaces $\Phi^j_{ik} : \mathcal{H}_k \to \mathcal{H}_i$ defined by

$$\Phi^j_{ik}(z) = \langle a|b(z)|c\rangle, \tag{7.15}$$

where a, b and c are any fields in the respective conformal blocks i, j and k, (denoted as $\mathcal{H}_i$, etc). Here we assume that $N^i_{jk} = 1$. (If $N^i_{jk} > 1$, we add, as usual, a label for the different couplings, which ranges to N^i_{jk}.) Graphically, the chiral vertex operator is depicted in fig. (7.8). The matrix C can now be interpreted as the braiding matrix of two chiral vertex operators,

$$\Phi_{s_1}(z)\Phi_{s_2}(w) = \sum_{s_1,s_2,s_3,s_4} R_{s_1,s_2,s_3,s_4} \Phi_{s_3}(w)\Phi_{s_4}(z), \tag{7.16}$$

where s_a stands for the triplet of primary fields, $s_a = \begin{pmatrix} & j_a & \\ i_a & & k_a \end{pmatrix}$, and the R matrix is defined by

$$R_{s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4} = \delta_{i_1 i_3}\delta_{k_2 k_3}\delta_{j_2 j_3}\delta_{k_1 i_2}\delta_{k_3 i_4} C_{k_1\,k_3} \begin{bmatrix} j_1 & j_2 \\ i_1 & k_2 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{7.17}$$

and where the delta functions ensure the proper sewing of the intermediate Hilbert spaces.

In passing, note the remarkable resemblance of eq. (16) with the Fadeev–Zamolodchikov kink operators exchange algebra,

$$K_a(u)K_b(0) = \sum_{cd} S_{a,b,c,d}(u)K_d(0)K_c(u), \tag{7.18}$$

where a, b, c and d label different kinks, u is the rapidity, and $S_{abcd}(u)$ is the scattering matrix for the kink process $a + b \to c + d$ (see section (10)). In fact, we will establish in the sequel that the two formulations are very closely related, and that the conformal braiding matrix can be thought of as the UV limit of the kink S matrix, eq. (18).[⋆]

Now, the associativity of the conformal braiding algebra, eq. (16), implies the YBE,

$$R_{12}R_{23}R_{12} = R_{23}R_{12}R_{23}, \tag{7.19}$$

where $R_{i,j}$ acts on the i, j Hilbert spaces in the triplet $V \times V \times V$, and is an identity in k. The Young Baxter equation, eq. (19) is equivalent to the hexagon identity, eq. (14). It follows, that the R matrix forms a representation of the braid group, eq. (8), where we identify $R_{i,i+1}$ with the operation σ_i of braiding the i and $i + 1$ strands.

Let us return now to the IRF lattice models. At the limit of $u \to i\infty$ the face transfer matrices $X_i(u)$ form a representation of the braid group. Similarly, the R matrix form a representation of the same braid group. It is only natural to identify the two representations. More precisely, consider the most general IRF Boltzmann

---

[⋆] Eq. (18) thus suggests that the kink operators (which are the composite fields creating the kinks out of the vacuum) smoothly extrapolate the chiral vertex operators, at the the extreme UV (i.e., critical) limit. This is particularly notable, since the kink operators, and their correlation functions, is a relatively ill understood subject, whereas in the RCFT this is very well understood. We hope that this observation can be used to understand better this slightly abstruse problem.

weight,

$$w_{s_1,s_2}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right), \tag{7.20}$$

which is the weight attached to the face with a, b, c and d at the vertices, where a, b,c and d are some primary fields, and s_1 and s_2 are arbitrary primary fields which label the model, fig. (7.1). The admissibility condition reads, $N^a_{s_1,b} = N^b_{s_2,d} = N^d_{s_1,c} = N^c_{s_2,a} = 1$.

Now, we identify, for $u \to i\infty$ the Boltzmann weight w, eq. (20), with the conformal braiding matrix R (up to an irrelevant factor),

$$\lim_{u\to i\infty} w_{s_1,s_2}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) = R_{t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4}, \tag{7.21}$$

where $t_1 = \binom{s_1}{a\,b}$, $t_2 = \binom{s_2}{b\,c}$, $t_3 = \binom{s_1}{d\,a}$, and $t_4 = \binom{s_2}{c\,d}$. We used all the six delta functions in the definition of R, eq. (18), showing that w contains all the information in the R matrix, and is an alternative presentation for it. Recall that the R matrix vanishes unless $N^{i_a}_{j_a k_a} > 0$. The crux of the identification, eq. (21), is that, very importantly, and lo and behold, the Boltzmann weight satisfies the precise fusion admissibility conditions, eq. (4). Further, since the R matrix satisfies the YBE eq. (18), it follows that w satisfies, for any s_1 and s_2 the star-triangle relation eq. (3). It follows that w, as defined, corresponds to a family of integrable lattice models, which are based on the fusion rules of any RCFT. We shall label the model as IRF$(\mathcal{O}, h, v)$, where $\mathcal{O}$ is any RCFT, and h and v are arbitrary primary fields which give the horizontal and vertical admissibility conditions.

Next, we wish to exhibit trigonometric solutions of the fusion STE relations eq. (3), which at the limit $u \to i\infty$ coincide with the Boltzmann weights described above. To do so, we shall first make the simplifying assumption that the link primary fields h and v are 'fundamental', i.e., the operator product of h with v

contains exactly two primary fields[†]. In terms of the fusion ring,

$$hv = \psi_1 + \psi_2, \tag{7.22}$$

where ψ_i are two primary fields. The case of more than two primary fields is discussed in section (9). In most of the following, for notational simplicity, we shall assume that $h = v = x$, a fixed primary field for both the horizontal and the vertical couplings. The arguments below do not depend, however, on this assumption. Denote by Δ_x, Δ_1 and Δ_2 the dimensions of these fields. For example, in the case of $SU(N)_k$, the field x can stand for the fundamental (N) representation. The fact that $x^2 = \psi_1 + \psi_2$ implies that the four point function $\langle i\, x\, x\, j \rangle$ has only two conformal blocks labeled by the ψ_i, $i = 1, 2$. It follows that the R matrix is two dimensional, using the N move, fig. (7.9). From fig. (7.9), is clear that the eigenvalues of R are always given by

$$\lambda_i = \epsilon_i e^{i\pi(\Delta_h + \Delta_v - \Delta_i)}, \tag{7.23}$$

where $\epsilon_i = \pm 1$ signify whether the coupling is symmetric or anti–symmetric, and the equation holds for arbitrary h and v [53]. It follows that the R matrix obeys the fixed polynomial equation,

$$\prod_{p=1}^{n} (R_i - \lambda_p) = 0, \tag{7.24}$$

where λ_i are given by eq. (23). In the two block case, eq. (21), R_i obeys a quadratic equation, eq. (24), which by choosing normalizations,

$$\sigma_i = R_i e^{-i\pi(\Delta_h + \Delta_v)} e^{i\pi(\Delta_1 + \Delta_2)/2},$$

[†] The one block case correspond to a trivial $U(1)$ monodromy (which is a property of free boson theories), in which case X_i is one dimensional, and thus proportional to the trivial solution $X_i = 1_i$.

is set in the more standard form

$$\sigma_i^2 = 1 + (q^{-1} - q)\sigma_i, \tag{7.25}$$

The braid group relations, eq. (10) along with the quadratic relation, eq. (25), are the defining relations for the Hecke algebra of type A_N. The parameter q depends on the RCFT and the particular fields h and v. Introduce also the notation,

$$q = e^{2i\hat{\lambda}}, \qquad \text{and } l = \frac{\pi}{\hat{\lambda}}, \tag{7.26}$$

where $\hat{\lambda}$ is termed the crossing parameter and l which is a rational number is termed the 'level'. Then, from eq. (22), (assuming $\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 = -1$, which is always the case),

$$\hat{\lambda} = \frac{\pi(\Delta_1 - \Delta_2)}{2}. \tag{7.27}$$

For example, in the $SU(N)_k$ we find $l = k + N$ in the N–$\bar{N}$ channel, and for the (r, s) minimal model [54] with the $(2, 1)$ generator, we find $l = s/r$, and with the $(1, 2)$ generator $l = r/s$.

Following ref. [53] we can actually express Δ_x in terms of the conformal dimensions Δ_i. Using the braid relation on the sphere, eq. (11), taking a trace, and using eq. (23), we find,

$$e^{i\pi(8\Delta_x - 3\Delta_1 - 3\Delta_2)} = 1, \tag{7.28}$$

where we used also the fact that the relation, eq. (11), has the value $e^{-4\pi i\Delta_x}$, i.e., R forms a projective representation of the sphere braid group, which follows from the behavior of the four point function at infinity.

It is convenient to define the generators U_i,

$$U_i = q^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \sigma_i, \tag{7.29}$$

which obey the alternative presentation of the Hecke algebra,

$$\begin{aligned} U_i^2 &= \beta U_i, \\ U_i U_j &= U_j U_i, \qquad \text{if } |i-j| \geq 2, \\ U_i U_{i+1} U_i - U_i &= U_{i+1} U_i U_{i+1} - U_{i+1}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.30}$$

where, $\beta = 2\cos(\hat{\lambda})$.

Define now the following face transfer matrix,

$$X_i(u) = \sin(\hat{\lambda} - u) \cdot 1_i + \sin u \cdot U_i, \tag{7.31}$$

where 1_i is the unit face transfer matrix. Clearly $X_i(u)$ still represents a fusion IRF face transfer matrix, with the correct admissibility conditions. Further, a direct calculation using the Hecke algebra, eq. (30), readily shows that for all u, the face transfer matrices obey the Young–Baxter equation,

$$X_i(u) X_{i+1}(u+v) X_i(v) = X_{i+1}(v) X_i(u+v) X_{i+1}(u), \tag{7.32}$$

and

$$X_i(u) X_j(v) = X_j(v) X_i(u), \qquad \text{for } |i-j| \geq 2. \tag{7.33}$$

Thus the $X_i(u)$ form a trigonometric solution of the Young–Baxter equation. Further, it is clear that $\sigma_i = X_i = \lim_{u \to i\infty} e^{iu} X_i(u)$, and thus $X_i(u)$ indeed extrapolates the conformal braiding matrix. We find also $X_i(0) \propto 1_i$, which is another standard requirement of IRF models. (Connected, as mentioned, to the fact that the corresponding kink system should have no scattering at zero rapidity, see section (10).) The resulting Boltzmann weights $w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right)$ obey the STE relation, implying that the transfer matrices commute for different values of u, and thus the lattice theory is solvable. This completes the construction of the trigonometric IRF($\mathcal{O}, x, x$) models for any RCFT, $\mathcal{O}$, and for a fundamental field x. Evidently, the entire discussion applies, as is, for the case of different horizontal and vertical couplings, $h \neq v$, as long as the number of fields in the product hv is equal to two. For more than two fields, one can construct the trigonometric solutions in a number of ways. The simplest, perhaps, is using the so called fusion procedure of IRF models ref. [55], (for applications of the fusion procedure, see e.g., [56]), which is equivalent to the bootstraping of soliton systems (for a review see, for example, [57]), or the fusion of R matrices in RCFT. Alternatively, one may proceed directly, by choosing the relevant ansatz. This is described in section (9). The results of either of the methods are the same, and, in any event, the fundamental Boltzmann weights contain all the information regarding the others, via the fusion procedure.

Another question is generalizing the trigonometric solutions to full off critical, i.e., elliptic, solutions, which leads to a solvable thermalization of the lattice models. For the two block case, we again expect this to be straightforward, essentially replacing each of the sines with the appropriate theta function, or replacing $\sin u$ with $\Theta_1(u;p)$ in the notation of eq. (8.27), where p is a parameter which measures the distance from criticality[⋆], (see more in section (8)). This will be reported elsewhere ref. [1].

[⋆] The complication stems from the fact that some of the '1's have to be replaced by an appropriate Θ function, $\Theta(u;p)$, such that $\Theta(u;0) = 1$. I thank T. Miwa for a discussion on this.

8. Graph State IRF and RCFT

Consider a general IRF model defined on a square lattice, fig. (7.1). Assume, for simplicity, that the horizontal and vertical admissibility conditions are the same, and that the states of the model are labeled by the elements $a \in S$, where S is some finite set. The admissibility condition can be represented as a set of pairs (a, b) such that a is adjacent to b. Alternatively, define the set $K \subset S \times S$ by

$$K = \{(a, b) | b \sim a\} , \tag{8.1}$$

where we used the notation $b \sim a$ to denote that (b, a) is an admissible pair. Note that the order is important, and $b \sim a$ does not necessarily implies that $a \sim b$. We also allow $a \sim a$ as an admissible pair. Now, the pair (S, K) defines an oriented graph, with the possibility of one[†] self loop on each vertex. The points of the graph are the elements of S, and the lines go from all a to b such that $(a, b) \in K$. We put an arrow on the line to indicate the direction, unless both (a, b) and (b, a) are in K, in which case we omit the arrow. We thus get a graphical representation of the model.

Assume that the IRF is a fusion theory associated to some conformal field theory, i.e., IRF$(\mathcal{O}, x, x)$, where $\mathcal{O}$ denote the RCFT, and x the primary field used to construct the model, as in section (7). Recall, that the admissibility condition is, $a \sim b$ iff the fusion coefficient obeys $N_{x,a}^{b} = 1$. Then, according to the rules above we find the oriented graph $K = \left\{(a, b) \middle| N_{x,a}^{b} = 1\right\}$, which will be termed the admissibility graph for the model IRF$(\mathcal{O}, x)$. In fig. (8.1) examples of fusion admissibility graphs are depicted. The graphs are convenient visualizations for the model.

[†] Actually, in general the number of lines may be more then one. For fusion IRF these denote the number of couplings N_{na}^{b} which can be any positive integer. Fig. (8.1,d) is such an example.

Now, recall the defining relations of the Hecke algebra eq. (7.30),

$$\begin{aligned} H_iH_{i+1}H_i - H_i &= H_{i+1}H_iH_{i+1} - H_{i+1}, \\ H_iH_j &= H_jH_i \qquad \text{if } |i-j| \geq 2, \\ H_i^2 &= \beta H_i. \end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

Given any representation of the Hecke algebra, we can build an IRF model as explained in the previous section. The face transfer matrices $X_i(u)$ are

$$X_i(u) = \sin(\lambda - u) \cdot 1_i + \sin u \cdot H_i, \tag{8.3}$$

where the crossing parameter λ obeys $\beta = 2\cos\lambda$. The $X_i(u)$ so defined satisfy the YBE, eqs. (7.6,7.7). We can define a representation of the Hecke algebra, for any graph, by choosing the ansatz,

$$\langle a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}|H_i|a_{i-1}, a_i', a_{i+1}\rangle = \delta_{a_{i-1},a_{i+1}} \left[\frac{\psi(a_i)\psi(a_i')}{\psi(a_{i-1})\psi(a_{i+1})}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{8.4}$$

where the states on the right and left are admissible. Now, the first two relations of the Hecke algebra, eq. (2), are easily verified for all choices of $\psi(a)$. Further, it can be checked that

$$H_iH_{i\pm1}H_i - H_i = 0, \tag{8.5}$$

which is a stronger form of the braiding relation. The algebra satisfied by the H_i is the Hecke algebra, with a quotient by the ideal generated by eq. (5), and is termed the Temperly–Lieb algebra. The third relation, $H_i^2 = \beta H_i$, is equivalent to

$$\sum_{\substack{b \\ (b,a)\in K}} \psi(b) = \beta\psi(a), \tag{8.6}$$

which is an eigenvalue problem for the connectivity matrix, where the eigenvectors are $\psi(a)$, and the eigenvalue is β. Further, we should require, due to eq. (6), that $\psi(a) \neq 0$ for all a, which limits the possible allowed eigenvectors. The IRF model, so obtained, will be referred to as a graph–state IRF. Such models have been described before, in particular, in association with the A-D-E Dynkin graphs [58, 6, 3]. Now assume that the model is the fusion IRF$(\mathcal{O}, x)$. Then eq. (6) becomes,

$$\sum_b N_{x,a}^b \psi(a) = \beta\psi(b), \tag{8.7}$$

i.e., the ψ's diagonalize the fusion rules with respect to x. The solution to this eigenvalue problem is well known ref. [8, 19] being given in terms of the points of the fusion variety,

$$\psi_\gamma(a) = \frac{S_{a,\gamma}}{S_{0,\gamma}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \frac{S_{x,\gamma}}{S_{0,\gamma}}, \tag{8.8}$$

where γ is any primary field, labeling the different solutions, and S is the conformal S matrix. The eigenvalue problem is then equivalent to the well known relationship between the fusion rules and the S matrix,

$$\sum_b N_{x,a}^b \frac{S_{b,\gamma}}{S_{0,\gamma}} = \frac{S_{x,\gamma}}{S_{0,\gamma}} \frac{S_{a,\gamma}}{S_{0,\gamma}}, \tag{8.9}$$

which simply means that the value of the primary fields on the points of the fusion variety $[a](x_\gamma) = \psi_\gamma(a)$ represent the fusion algebra. To summarize, the IRF($\mathcal{O}$,x) graph–state model Boltzmann weights are

$$w_\gamma \left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix} \middle| u \right) = \delta_{b,c} \sin(\lambda - u) + \delta_{a,d} \sin u \left[\frac{S_{b,\gamma} S_{c,\gamma}}{S_{a,\gamma} S_{d,\gamma}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{8.10}$$

where γ is any primary field, which labels the different graph–state IRF models associated to the fusion rules of $\mathcal{O}$, and the crossing parameter λ is

$$\beta = 2\cos\lambda = \frac{S_{x,\gamma}}{S_{0,\gamma}}. \tag{8.11}$$

Note that, for the sake of consistency, we must choose a primary field γ, such that

$S_{a,\gamma} \neq 0$, for all primary fields a. Otherwise, there are no restrictions on γ[⋆].

The graph–state Boltzmann weights obey a number of important properties, which are evident from their definition eq. (10),

Regularity:

$$w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| 0\right) = \sqrt{\rho(0)}\delta_{b,c}, \tag{8.12}$$

Time reversal:

$$w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ d & c \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) = w\left(\begin{matrix} c & b \\ d & a \end{matrix}\middle| u\right), \tag{8.13}$$

Crossing symmetry:

$$w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ d & c \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) = \left[\frac{S_{a,\gamma}S_{c,\gamma}}{S_{b,\gamma}S_{d,\gamma}}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} w\left(\begin{matrix} b & c \\ a & d \end{matrix}\middle| \lambda - u\right), \tag{8.14}$$

Unitarity:

$$\sum_e w\left(\begin{matrix} e & c \\ a & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) w\left(\begin{matrix} b & c \\ a & e \end{matrix}\middle| -u\right) = \rho(u)\delta_{b,d}, \tag{8.15}$$

where $\rho(u) = F(u)F(-u)$ is some function (termed the unitarizing factor). Using the face transfer matrices $X_i(u)$, the unitarity property may be written as

$$X_i(u)X_i(-u) = F(u) \cdot 1_i. \tag{8.16}$$

The r.h.s. of eq. (16) becomes

$$X_i(u)X_i(-u) = [\sin(\lambda - u)1_i + \sin u H_i][\sin(\lambda + u)1_i - \sin u H_i], \tag{8.17}$$

where H_i obeys the Hecke algebra, eq. (2). Using the Hecke relation, $H_i^2 = \beta H_i$

[⋆] Of course, requiring a sensible probabilistic interpretation of the Boltzmann weights implies that ω, eq. (10), must be real and positive for all a, b, c and d. This puts severe limitations on the allowed graphs and choices of γ. However, there is no reason to think that the general, non-probabilistic theory, does not represent a sensible field theory for any values of ω. A similar situation is encountered in discretized models with topological terms, e.g., CP^n sigma model in two dimensions with a topological term, $\theta \neq 0$.

and $\beta = 2\cos\lambda$, it follows immediately that eq. (16) holds, with

$$\rho(u) = \sin(\lambda + u)\sin(\lambda - u), \tag{8.18}$$

and thus the IRF models based on any Hecke algebra, via the ansatz eq. (7.31), are always unitary. In particular, all the graph state fusion IRF models described in this section are unitary.

The graph–state construction gives us an easy way to build an IRF model from any given rational conformal field theory. In general, however, it is not a true fusion IRF, since the configurations appearing in $w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right)$ are not all the ones that are allowed by the admissibility condition, but rather, only the ones for which $a = d$ or $b = c$. For special graphs, i.e., trees with no self loops except at the end points, it is clear that the admissibility conditions indeed imply that $a = d$ or $b = c$. Thus also, for such theories, the state–graph model is the correct fusion IRF. Further, it can be shown, that up to irrelevant factors, the general Hecke ansatz always reduces to a state graph model for trees. This gives us an immediate way to express the conformal braiding matrix in terms of the torus S matrix in such theories, since both give rise to same IRF model. Comparison of eqs. (7.30) and eq. (10) shows that, up to an irrelevant overall factor,

$$R_{t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4} = q^{-1/2}\delta_{b,c} - \left[\frac{S_{b,\gamma}S_{c,\gamma}}{S_{a,\gamma}S_{d,\gamma}}\right]\delta_{a,d}, \tag{8.19}$$

for some γ, up to irrelevant normalizations of the primary states[⋆].

At this point, the reader might wonder about the parameter γ, which labels apparently different solutions of the STE for the same fusion rules. From the perspective of the correspondence with the RCFT, this might seem puzzling, since

---

[⋆] In section (9) we will derive a more general form of this relation, eqs. (9.19), and its special case, eq. (9.22), based on the connection between the crossing properties of w and the RCFT torus modular transformations, eq. (9.20). Eq. (19) is the two block case of eq. (9.22), which holds for any RCFT.

a given RCFT is supposed to give rise to a unique IRF model. The resolution of this is that, indeed, different choices of γ correspond to different conformal field theories! Recall from section (5) that for a given set of fusion rules, there are a number of possibilities for consistent S matrices, which give rise to these fusion rules. The different S matrices are related by some permutation of the primary fields, p, such that $\hat{S}_{ab} = N_b S_{a,p(b)}$, where N_b are some non–vanishing normalizations. The allowed permutations are limited by $S_{ab} = S_{ba}$ and $S^2 = C$, which, however, are fulfilled for various permutations. Now, if we take $b = 1$ (the unit primary field), we find that, $\hat{S}_{a,1} = N_1 S_{a,\gamma}$, where $\gamma = p(1)$. Since $\hat{S}_{a,1} \neq 0$, this must be so, also, for $S_{a,b}$. Assume that a permutation p exists such that $\gamma = p(1)$ for all γ such that $S_{a,\gamma} \neq 0$ (and for all a), which obeys the RCFT properties listed above. Then we may assume, without any loss of generality, that $\gamma = 1$, the unit primary field, by replacing $S \to \hat{S}$ and $\gamma \to 1$. Then, also, we find a unique correspondence between the Boltzmann weights and the RCFT. We shall, thus, in the sequel, assume without any loss of generality, that $\gamma = 1$.

Example (a) : Consider the case of IRF($SU(2)_k, [1]$), where [1] stands for the fundamental representation, fig. (8.1,a). As was discussed in section (5) we may replace $SU(2)_k$ with $SU(2)_{k/p}$, for any integer p such that $\gcd(p, 2(k+2)) = 1$. The S matrix for $SU(2)_{p/k}$ is, using eq. (5.1)

$$S^p_{m,n} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{k+2}} \sin\left[\frac{\pi p(m+1)(n+1)}{k+2}\right], \tag{8.20}$$

where $m, n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k$, are the (twice) isospins of the different primary fields, and S^1_{mn} is the usual S matrix for $SU(2)_k$. All the different p's give the same fusion rules (c.f., section (5)). We find,

$$S^{p(n+1)}_{m,0} = S^p_{m,n}. \tag{8.21}$$

The condition $\gcd(n+1, 2(k+2)) = 1$ is precisely the one needed to ensure that $S^p_{m+1,n+1} \neq 0$, and we thus can identify the parameter $\gamma = n + 1$. Eq. (21) then shows that, indeed, we can assume without any loss of generality that $\gamma = 1$, by replacing S^p with $S^{\gamma p}$.

The state graph IRF$(SU(2)_{k/p}, [1])$ Boltzmann weights are obtained by substituting the S matrix, eq. (20), into eq. (10),

$$w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\,\middle|\, u\right) = \overset{a}{\underset{d}{c\Diamond b}} = \tag{8.22}$$

$$\sin(\lambda - u)\delta_{bc} + \delta_{ad}\sin u \frac{\sqrt{\sin[\pi p(b+1)/(k+2)]\sin[\pi p(c+1)/(k+2)]}}{\sin[\pi p(a+1)/(k+2)]},$$

where $\lambda = \frac{\pi p}{k+2}$, and a, b, c and d obey the admissibility conditions. Explicitly the Boltzmann weights, for $p = 1$, are,

$$w\left(\begin{matrix} m & m\pm 1 \\ m\pm 1 & m\pm 2 \end{matrix}\,\middle|\, v\right) = \overset{m}{\underset{m\pm 2}{m\pm 1\Diamond m\pm 1}} = \frac{[1-v]}{[1]}. \tag{8.23}$$

$$w\left(\begin{matrix} m & m\pm 1 \\ m\pm 1 & m \end{matrix}\,\middle|\, v\right) = \overset{m}{\underset{m}{m\pm 1\Diamond m\pm 1}} = \frac{[\pm v + m + 1]}{[m+1]}. \tag{8.24}$$

$$w\left(\begin{matrix} m & m\mp 1 \\ m\pm 1 & m \end{matrix}\,\middle|\, v\right) = \overset{m}{\underset{m}{m\pm 1\Diamond m\mp 1}} = \pm\frac{[v]}{[1]}\frac{\sqrt{[m+2][m]}}{[m+1]}, \tag{8.25}$$

where we used the variable $v = (k+2)u/\pi$, the symbol $[v] = \sin[\pi v/(k+2)]$, where the states are $j = 0, 1, 2 \ldots, k$, where Boltzmann weights where j is outside of this range vanish, and where we have divided all the Boltzmann weights by $\sin[\frac{\pi}{k+2}]$. The model for $p \neq 1$ is obtained by replacing $k+2$ with $(k+2)/p$ in the definitions of v and $[v]$, and no other changes. The Boltzmann weights eqs. (23-25) are identical to the ones originally given in ref. [59] for $p = 1$, and form the so called restricted height model. We conclude that the restricted height model is a graph state fusion IRF associated to $SU(2)_k$. Similarly, other values of p give rise to generalizations of the model. Note, however that for $p > 1$ some of the Boltzmann weights become complex, and thus no longer allow for a probability interpretation. The partition function remains, however, real and positive, and thus the models appear to represent bona–fide field theories. (See the footnote after eq. (11).)

Example (b): Consider the conformal field theory $SU(2)_{(2k+1)/p}/SU(2)_{p/(2k+1)}$ described in sects. (4,5,6). Again, take the field $x = [1]$ to be the fundamental representation. The graph of the theory is depicted in fig. (8.1,b). Substituting the S matrix, eq. (4.6), into the general graph–state representation, eq. (10), we find

$$S_{m,n} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2k+1}} \sin\left[\frac{\pi p(m+1)(n+1)}{2k+1}\right], \tag{8.26}$$

where $m, n = 0, 2, \ldots, 2k$. The Boltzmann weights are identical to those of $SU(2)_{2k+1}$, with the identification $n \equiv 2k + 1 - n$, and no other changes.

Example (c): The hard hexagon model on a square lattice (ref. [60]). The states of the classical hard hexagon model are labeled by the variables 0 and 1. The Boltzmann weights are expressed in terms of the elliptic function $\theta_1(u; p)$,

$$\theta_1(u;p) = 2p^{1/4} \sin u \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} [1 - 2p^{2n} \cos(2u) + p^{4n}](1 - p^{2n}), \tag{8.27}$$

where p is a parameter which measures the distance from criticality. The Boltzmann weights of the integrable hard hexagon model are (ref. [60])

$$
\begin{aligned}
&w_1 = 0\overset{0}{\underset{0}{\Diamond}}0 = \frac{\theta_1(3\lambda - u)}{\theta_1(3\lambda)}, \qquad w_2 = 0\overset{1}{\underset{0}{\Diamond}}0 = 0\overset{0}{\underset{1}{\Diamond}}0 = \frac{\theta_1(\lambda - u)}{\theta_1(\lambda)},\\
&w_3 = 1\overset{0}{\underset{0}{\Diamond}}0 = 0\overset{0}{\underset{0}{\Diamond}}1 = \frac{\theta_1(u)}{\sqrt{\theta_1(\lambda)\theta_1(2\lambda)}},\\
&w_4 = 0\overset{1}{\underset{1}{\Diamond}}0 = \frac{\theta_1(4\lambda - u)}{\theta_1(4\lambda)}, \qquad w_5 = 1\overset{0}{\underset{0}{\Diamond}}1 = \frac{\theta_1(2\lambda - u)}{\theta_1(2\lambda)},
\end{aligned}
\tag{8.28}
$$

where we used the short hand notation, $\theta_1(u;p) \equiv \theta_1(u)$, and where $\lambda = \frac{\pi}{5}$ is the crossing parameter. The model becomes critical for $p = 0$, in which case the five amplitudes become the trigonometric solutions (using $\lim_{p\to 0} \theta_1(u;p)/(2p^{1/4}) = \sin u$),

$$
\begin{aligned}
w_1 = \frac{[3\lambda - u]}{[3\lambda]}, \qquad w_2 = \frac{[\lambda - u]}{[\lambda]}, \qquad &w_3 = \frac{[u]}{\sqrt{[\lambda][2\lambda]}},\\
&w_4 = \frac{[4\lambda - u]}{[4\lambda]}, \qquad w_5 = \frac{[2\lambda - u]}{[2\lambda]},
\end{aligned}
\tag{8.29}
$$

where we defined $[u] = \sin u$. It is straight forward to verify that these Boltzmann weights are identical to the state–graph IRF of $(G_2)_1$, given in example (b), with $k = p = 1$, up to multiplying by an overall factor of $\sin\lambda$, and identifying the states by $0 = [2]$ and $1 = [0]$.

Example (d): The Ising model. This well known model can be presented as a graph–state fusion IRF theory, $\mathrm{IRF}(\mathrm{SU}(2)_2), [1])$, example (a), with $k = 2$. In this case the state variables are $j = 0, 1, 2$. Since a square lattice is a bipartite graph, and so is the admissibility graph, the configurations on the lattice break into two disjoint sets, where all even (odd) sites on the lattice are occupied by $j = 1$. Choosing the latter possibility, we may decimate the odd lattice sites where $j = 1$, to get a square lattice where the state variables are $S = j - 1 = \pm 1$. The four Boltzmann weights of the fusion IRF are related to the Ising horizontal and vertical couplings, J_1 and J_2, by (e.g., for a review, see [3]),

$$w_1(u) = y_1 e^{-J_1} = 0\overset{1}{\underset{1}{\Diamond}}2 = 2\overset{1}{\underset{1}{\Diamond}}0 = \frac{\theta_1(u+\lambda;p)}{\theta_1(\lambda;p)}, \tag{8.30}$$

$$w_2(u) = y_1 e^{J_1} = 0\overset{1}{\underset{1}{\Diamond}}0 = 2\overset{1}{\underset{1}{\Diamond}}2 = \frac{\theta_1(\lambda-u;p)}{\theta_1(\lambda;p)}, \tag{8.31}$$

$$w_3(u) = y_2 e^{-J_2} = 1\overset{0}{\underset{2}{\Diamond}}1 = 1\overset{2}{\underset{0}{\Diamond}}1 = \epsilon\frac{\theta_1(u;p)}{\theta_1(2\lambda;p)}, \tag{8.32}$$

$$w_4(u) = y_2 e^{J_2} = 1\overset{0}{\underset{0}{\Diamond}}1 = 1\overset{2}{\underset{2}{\Diamond}}1 = \frac{\theta_1(2\lambda-u;p)}{\theta_1(2\lambda;p)}, \tag{8.33}$$

where $\lambda = \pi/4$, $\epsilon = \pm 1$, and y_1 and y_2 are some constants. The relationship of the temperature parameter p and u with the Ising couplings J_1 and J_2 is then seen to be,

$$e^{2J_1} = \frac{\theta_1(\lambda-u;p)}{\theta_1(\lambda+u;p)}, \qquad e^{2J_2} = \frac{\theta_1(2\lambda-u;p)}{\theta_1(u;p)}. \tag{8.34}$$

The model becomes critical for $p = 0$, giving the two Ising couplings (horizontal and vertical ones) at the fixed point. Now, it is a straightforward exercise, which is left to the reader, to verify that at the critical limit, $p \to 0$, the Boltzmann weights w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4 are identical to the fusion IRF ones for $SU(2)_2$, where we set in example (a), $k = 2$ and $p = \epsilon$.

Example (e): Let us return now to the previous section, where the relationship between RCFT and their corresponding IRF lattice models was discussed. As a particular example, consider the case of $SU(2)$ where the braiding matrix, R, have been computed, ref. [61, 62]. From the IRF Boltzmann weights described in section (7), we may compute the $u \to \infty$ limit, which should correspond to the conformal braiding matrix, as explained in section (7). We find,

$$R\left(\begin{array}{c} j \\ j{\pm}1 \Diamond j{\pm}1 \\ j \end{array}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} -q^{-(j/2+3/4)}[1]/[j+1] & \sqrt{q^{-1/2}[j][j+2]}/[j+1] \\ \sqrt{q^{-1/2}[j][j+2]}/[j+1] & q^{(j/2+1/4)}[1]/[j+1] \end{pmatrix} . \tag{8.35}$$

The R matrix so computed is, indeed, also, identical to the R matrix obtained from the $SL(2)_q$ universal R matrix [62], and is identical to the conformal braiding matrix of $SU(2)_k$, up to an irrelevant similarity transformation (which depends on the normalizations of the primary blocks). We conclude the the model IRF$(SU(2), [1])$ gives an alternative derivation for the restricted height model, example (a).

Example (f): The braiding matrix of $SU(N)_k$ in the N-N channel are computed in ref. [63], where the general calculation for the braiding matrices of any two block RCFT are found as solutions of the corresponding Riemann monodromy problem. The result for $SU(n)_k$ can be expressed in terms of the quantity $q = e^{2\pi i/(k+N)}$ and the function

$$[x] := \frac{q^{x/2} - q^{-x/2}}{q^{1/2} - q^{-1/2}} = \frac{\sin(\frac{\pi x}{k+N})}{\sin(\frac{\pi}{k+N})} . \tag{8.36}$$

The braiding matrix then assumes the form,

$$B\left(\begin{array}{c} \lambda \\ \lambda{+}e_l \quad \Diamond \quad \lambda{+}e_m \\ \lambda{+}e_m{+}e_l \end{array}\right) = \frac{q^{-1/2N}}{[a_{lm}]} \begin{pmatrix} -q^{-a_{lm}/2} & \sqrt{[a_{lm}+1][a_{lm}-1]} \\ \sqrt{[a_{lm}+1][a_{lm}-1]} & q^{a_{lm}/2}, \end{pmatrix} , \tag{8.37}$$

where λ is any weight at the level k, f_u its signature sequence of the Young tableau (see sect. (2) for the definition), where $u = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, $a_{lm} = f_l - f_m + m - l$, and $e_l = \lambda_l - \lambda_{l-1}$, where λ_l is the fundamental weight, and we defined $\lambda_0 = \lambda_N = 0$.

Note, that for the special case of $SU(2)$, $N = 2$, the Braiding matrix agrees precisely with the one described earlier, eq. (35). As in the case of $SU(2)$, we can now proceed to construct the lattice model $\mathrm{IRF}(\mathrm{SU}(N)_k, N, N)$ using the formalism of section (7). The crossing parameter is given by, eq. (7.25), $\lambda = \pi(\Delta_1 - \Delta_2)/2 = \frac{\pi N/2}{k+N}$, where Δ_1 and Δ_2 are the dimensions of the two fields exchanged in this channel. The generator of the Hecke algebra is, as usual,

$$H = q^{-1/2} - e^{-i\pi(\Delta_1+\Delta_2-2\Delta_N)} B, \tag{8.38}$$

and it obeys the usual Hecke relation,

$$H^2 = \beta H, \qquad \text{where } \beta = 2\cos\lambda. \tag{8.39}$$

Explicitly, the Hecke algebra elements are given by

$$H_i = \begin{array}{ccc} & \scriptstyle\lambda & \\ \scriptstyle\lambda+e_j & \Diamond & \scriptstyle\lambda+e_k \\ & \scriptstyle\lambda+e_j+e_l & \end{array} = (1-\delta_{jl}) \frac{\big[s_{jl}(\lambda+e_j)s_{jl}(\lambda+e_k)\big]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{s_{jl}(\lambda)}, \tag{8.40}$$

where $s_{jl}(\lambda) = \sin[(\frac{\pi}{k+N})(e_j - e_l)\cdot\lambda]$. This expression agrees precisely with the representations of the Hecke algebra described by Wenzl [64]. Substituting this representation into eq. (7.31), we find the Boltzmann weights of the trigonometric lattice IRF model, which are,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\begin{array}{ccc} & \scriptstyle\lambda & \\ \scriptstyle\lambda+e_\mu & \Diamond & \scriptstyle\lambda+e_\mu \\ & \scriptstyle\lambda+2e_\mu & \end{array} = [1-u], \\
&\begin{array}{ccc} & \scriptstyle\lambda & \\ \scriptstyle\lambda+e_\mu & \Diamond & \scriptstyle\lambda+e_\mu \\ & \scriptstyle\lambda+e_\mu+e_\nu & \end{array} = \frac{[a_{\mu\nu}+u]}{[a_{\mu\nu}]}, \\
&\begin{array}{ccc} & \scriptstyle\lambda & \\ \scriptstyle\lambda+e_\nu & \Diamond & \scriptstyle\lambda+e_\mu \\ & \scriptstyle\lambda+e_\mu+e_\nu & \end{array} = p[u]\frac{\sqrt{[a_{\mu\nu}+1][a_{\mu\nu}-1]}}{[a_{\mu\nu}]},
\end{aligned} \tag{8.41}$$

where $p = \pm 1$ corresponds to two different solutions (given by B or its complex conjugate matrix, which is the braiding matrix of $SU(N)_{-1}$).

Amazingly, these are precisely the Boltzmann weights of the $SU(N)$ models described in ref. [7], at the critical limit, $p = 0$. This fully illustrates the universal connection described in the body of the paper between IRF models and RCFT, giving, in this particular instance, the Boltzmann weights of the solvable lattice models $\mathrm{IRF}(\mathrm{SU}(N)_k, N, N)$.

One can easily extend the results described here to other modular invariants of $SU(N)$, and their extended algebras. It is known that the same blocks appear in all modular invariants, and that the problem of writing the braiding matrices is a simple sesqui-linear re–juxtapositioning of the conformal blocks (see, for example, [65 − 69]). Substituting the so obtained braiding matrices into eq. (7.31), we would find new solvable IRF models, and an explicit solution for their Boltzmann weights. In fact, the Boltzmann weights of such models are known only in the case of $SU(2)$ (The ADE cases) , and some quotient (orbifold) cases [12, 71, 6]. For the general modular invariants of $SU(N)$ the problem of finding such Boltzmann weights have been posed in ref. [6] but none have been found so far. Our approach provides a straightforward solution for these Boltzmann weights. Clearly, the method is applicable to all rational conformal field theories, and the calculations described in this this example and in ref. [63] can readily be carried out for any theory.

9. General Fusion IRF Models

Let us now proceed to describe the general fusion IRF model based on any rational conformal field theory, $\mathcal{O}$, and any pair of primary fields, h and v, denoted as $\mathrm{IRF}(\mathcal{O}, h, v)$. In section (7) we have described the two block case, $hv = \psi_1 + \psi_2$, using Hecke algebra properties. Our purpose in this section is to describe the general case,

$$h \cdot v = \sum_{r=0}^{n-1} \psi_r, \tag{9.1}$$

where n is the number of primary fields, and ψ_r are the intermediate primary fields in the block. We shall begin by generalizing the Hecke algebra to a more general one, that will be termed the n-conformal braiding (n-CB) algebra. This algebra is a quotient algebra of the braid group algebra, and was already described in sect. (7). Recall the defining relations eqs. (7.19, 7.24),

$$\begin{aligned} R_iR_{i+1}R_i &= R_{i+1}R_iR_{i+1}, \\ R_iR_j &= R_jR_i \qquad \text{for } |i-j|\geq 2, \\ 0 &= \prod_{p=0}^{n-1}(R_i-\lambda_p), \end{aligned} \tag{9.2}$$

where the parameters λ_p are fixed, specify the algebra, and are arbitrary. Recall also from sect. (7) that the braiding matrix of any RCFT obeys the n-braiding algebra relations, eq. (9.2), with the eigenvalues which are,

$$\lambda_p = \epsilon_p e^{i\pi(\Delta_h+\Delta_v-\Delta_p)}, \tag{9.3}$$

where $\epsilon_p = \pm 1$, in accordance to whether ψ_p appears symmetrically $(+1)$ or anti-symmetrically (-1) in the product, and where Δ_h, Δ_v and Δ_p denote the dimensions of the corresponding fields. We shall assume that the fields are so arranged that

$$\epsilon_p = (-1)^{p-1}, \tag{9.4}$$

which can always be justified on group theoretical reasons. Clearly, the case of $n=2$ corresponds to the Hecke algebra described earlier, eq. (7.30) with

$$\beta = \frac{\lambda_0+\lambda_1}{\sqrt{\lambda_0\lambda_1}}. \tag{9.5}$$

Special cases of the n-CB algebra appeared in some IRF hierarchies, ref. [3] and references therein, but it has not been previously defined, in general (arbitrary parameters).

Consider now the braiding matrix of the primary fields h and v, $R_i^{h,v}$, which obeys the n-CB algebra eq. (2). We can now define the projection operators,

$$P_i^a = \prod_{p \neq a} \left[\frac{R_i - \lambda_p}{\lambda_a - \lambda_p} \right], \tag{9.6}$$

where $a = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$ labels the corresponding eigenvalue. From the n-CB algebra, the projection operators obey the relations,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a=0}^{n-1} P_i^a &= 1, \\ P_i^a P_i^b &= \delta_{ab} P_i^a, \\ \sum_{a=0}^{n-1} \lambda_a P_i^a &= R_i. \end{aligned} \tag{9.7}$$

Our purpose is to introduce trigonometric solutions of the YBE, $X_i(u)$,

$$X_i(u) X_{i+1}(u+v) X_i(v) = X_{i+1}(v) X_i(u+v) X_{i+1}(u). \tag{9.8}$$

Further, we shall require that at the extreme UV limits these solutions would coincide with the conformal braiding matrix,

$$\lim_{u \to i\infty} X_i(u) = R_i, \tag{9.9}$$

and that the correct admissibility conditions would be satisfied for all values of the spectral parameter u, i.e., the face transfer matrix $\langle a, b, d | X_i(u) | a, c, d \rangle$ vanishes unless $N_{ah}^b N_{bv}^c N_{ch}^d N_{dv}^a > 0$, where N_{jk}^i are the fusion coefficients. The above requirements essentially imply the following ansatz for the face transfer matrix,

$$X_i(u) = \sum_{a=0}^{n-1} f_a(u) P_i^a, \tag{9.10}$$

where $f_a(u)$ are the eigenvalues of $X_i(u)$, and are scalar functions of the spectral parameter u. On physical grounds we shall also demand the regularity relation,

$$X_i(0) \propto 1_i. \tag{9.11}$$

The set of constraints (10,11) are fulfilled provided that the functions $f_a(u)$ are such that

$$\begin{aligned} f_a(0) &= 1, \\ \lim_{a \to i\infty} f_a(u) &= K e^{-i\pi\Delta_a}, \end{aligned} \tag{9.12}$$

where K is some constant. Then the face transfer matrices $X_i(u)$ obey the correct UV and IR limits, as can be verified using the relations obeyed by the projections operators, eq. (7).

It can be shown, via considerable algebraic computations, that all the relations specified so far, and in particular the YBE, eq. (8), hold provided that

$$f_a(u) = \left[\prod_{r=0}^{n-1} \sin(\zeta_i + u) \right] \left[\prod_{r=a}^{n-1} \sin(\zeta_i - u) \right], \tag{9.13}$$

where the parameters ζ_i,

$$\zeta_i = \pi(\Delta_{i+1} - \Delta_i)/2, \tag{9.14}$$

are the 'crossing parameters'. It can be checked that the functions, $f_a(u)$, indeed, obey the relations, eq. (12),

$$f_a(0) = \prod_{a=0}^{n-1} \sin \zeta_i, \tag{9.15}$$

and

$$\lim_{u \to i\infty} X_i(u) e^{-(n-1)iu} = e^{-i\pi(\Delta_h + \Delta_v)} R_i. \tag{9.16}$$

We conclude that the face transfer matrices $X_i(u)$, eq. (10), indeed give rise to the Boltzmann weights of the solvable lattice model IRF$(\mathcal{O}, h, v)$ associated to an arbitrary conformal field theory $\mathcal{O}$ and arbitrary primary fields h and v.

As a side remark, note that we need not restrict ourselves to primary fields h and v, but can, in fact, take any algebraic combination of primary fields, $h = \sum c_i p_i$, where c_i are some constants, and p_i are the primary fields, and similarly for v. In other words, h and v can be taken to be any elements of the fusion ring, and the admissibility condition are taken as $a \sim b$ iff $ah = nb + \ldots$, where $n > 0$ labels the couplings, and the product is in the fusion ring. (Alternatively $n = (a|hb) > 0$, using the inner product of the fusion ring ref. [8]). We would then get an IRF model associated to arbitrary elements of the fusion ring, h and v. The R matrix, is simply the corresponding linear combination of the separate R matrices,

$$R_{h,v} = \sum_{n,m} c_n d_m R_{n,m}, \tag{9.17}$$

where c_n and d_n are arbitrary complex coefficients, which express the fields h and v in the basis of the primary fields. The YBE relation is evidently satisfied, since $R_{h,v}$ is the braiding of the fields h and v, and thus corresponds to the braid group on the punctured sphere. Evidently, the general R matrices satisfy a fixed polynomial equation, with some eigenvalues λ_p, which do not depend on the external legs, since this is so for each of the component matrices in eq. (17). Hence, projection operators can be defined as in eq. (6). The rest of the construction of the Boltzmann weights $X_i(u)$ follows as before, and these are given by the same formula, eq. (10), with the replacement of the old projection operators by the new ones, and no other change. The projection operators are now simply labeled by $P^p_{h,v}$ for each of the primary fields h and v and each of the fields appearing in their product, p. Thus we can still associate primary fields and dimensions to each channel, and proceed as before. We find that the braiding matrix is

$$X_i(u) = \sum_{n,m} c_n d_m e^{i\pi(\Delta_n + \Delta_m)} \sum_a P^a_{n,m} f^a_{n,m}(u), \tag{9.18}$$

where the functions $f^a_{n,m}(u)$ are defined as before, eq. (13), with the obvious replacements, and the projection operators are the same ones for each of the channels. Thus $X_i(u)$ is a linear combination of the face transfer matrices in each of the channels,

$$X_i(u) = \sum_{n,m} c_n d_m e^{i\pi(\Delta_n+\Delta_m)} X_i^{n,m}(u), \tag{9.19}$$

where $X_i^{n,m}$ is given by eq. (10), and is the face transfer matrix for the model IRF$(\mathcal{O}, n, m)$. Evidently, $X_i(u)$ obeys the same properties as before, eqs. (9,11).

Returning from this digression, consider now the case where $h = \bar{v}$ (or more generally as in the discussion above, where $hv = 1 + \ldots$, and where h and v are arbitrary elements of the fusion ring). Then it follows that the unit operator is one of the fields ψ_i exchanged in the channel, and we can assume without any loss of generality that this field is $\psi_0 = 1$. Now, the parameter $\lambda = \zeta_0 = \pi(\Delta_1 - \Delta_0)/2$ is the crossing parameter of the model. In other words, the following highly non–trivial relation holds,

$$w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| \lambda - u\right) = \left[\frac{S_{b,0}S_{c,0}}{S_{a,0}S_{d,0}}\right]^{1/2} w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right), \tag{9.20}$$

where S is the torus modular matrix, and $\left[\frac{S_{b,0}S_{c,0}}{S_{a,0}S_{d,0}}\right]^{1/2}$ is the universal crossing multiplier, and where we have used the standard face transfer matrix notation,

$$w\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) = \langle a, b, d | X_i(u) | a, c, d \rangle. \tag{9.21}$$

The proof of the crossing relation, eq. (20), entails the usage of the braiding relations on the torus, and will be described in ref. [1].

A particular consequence of the crossing relation, is the expression for the projection operator P_0 which reads

$$P_0 = \left[\prod_i \frac{\sin\zeta_i}{\sin(\zeta_i + \lambda)}\right] \left[\frac{S_{b,0}S_{c,0}}{S_{a,0}S_{d,0}}\right]^{1/2}, \tag{9.22}$$

which follows by applying the crossing relation to $X_i(0)$, and by noting that while $X_i(0) \propto 1_i$, $X_i(\lambda) \propto P_0$. Similarly, relations among all projection operators can be derived, using the various crossing points. Note that eq. (8.19) is a special case, for trees, of the general eq. (9.22).

From the expression for $X_i(u)$, eqs. (10,13), it is straightforward to compute,

$$X_i(u)X_i(-u) = 1_i \sum_a f_a(u) f_a(-u) = n\rho(u) 1_i, \tag{9.23}$$

where

$$\rho(u) = \prod_{r=0}^{n-1} \sin(\zeta_i - u)\sin(\zeta_i + u). \tag{9.24}$$

It follows that the IRF theories are always unitary, i.e., they obey the property eq. (8.15), with a unitarity factor which is $\rho(u)$. Evidently also eq. (11) (the regularity) holds. Consequently the IRF models described in this section obey all the standard properties of IRF theories, eqs. (8.12–8.18). These properties will be of importance in the next section where soliton scattering theories are constructed, based on the fusion lattice models.

Example: Consider the case of IRF(SU(2)$_k$, [2], [2]) where [2] corresponds to the adjoint representation of $SU(2)_k$ WZNW RCFT. The projection operators can be calculated from the known structure constants, ref. [72], of the RCFT. Alternatively, the projection operators are related to the corresponding $SU(2)_q$ quantum group $6-j$ symbols [62]. Explicitly, these are as follows [73]. Denote the projection operators for a given face in the notation,

$$\langle a, b, d|P^i|a, c, d\rangle = P^i \left(\begin{array}{ccc} & a & \\ c & \Diamond & b \\ & d & \end{array} \right). \tag{9.25}$$

Denote also $P^i \left(\begin{array}{ccc} & a & \\ c & \Diamond & b \\ & d & \end{array} \right)$ by the matrix $(P^i)_{bc} = \sigma_{bc}$, and let $a = j$. We then find

$$P^0 \qquad\qquad d = a \pm 1 \qquad\qquad \sigma = 0,$$

$$P^0 \qquad d = a \qquad \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{j,j} & \sigma_{j,j+1} \\ \sigma_{j+1,j} & \sigma_{j-1,j-1} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{[2]}{[2j+4]} \begin{pmatrix} [2j] & \sqrt{[2j][2j+4]} \\ \sqrt{[2j][2j+4]} & [2j+4] \end{pmatrix},$$

$$P^1 \qquad d = a+1 \qquad \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{j,j} & \sigma_{j,j-1} \\ \sigma_{j+1,j} & \sigma_{j-1,j+1} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{[2]}{[4][2j+4]} \begin{pmatrix} [2j] & \sqrt{[2j][2j+4]} \\ \sqrt{[2j][2j+4]} & [2j+4] \end{pmatrix},$$

$$P^1 \qquad d = a-1 \qquad \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{j,j} & \sigma_{j,j-1} \\ \sigma_{j-1,j} & \sigma_{j-1,j-1} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{[2]}{[4][2j]} \begin{pmatrix} [2j+2] & -\sqrt{[2j+2][2j-2]} \\ -\sqrt{[2j+2][2j-2]} & [2j-2] \end{pmatrix},$$

$$P^1 \qquad d = j \qquad \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{j-1,j-1} & \sigma_{j-1,j} & \sigma_{j-1,j+1} \\ \sigma_{j,j-1} & \sigma_{j,j} & \sigma_{j,j+1} \\ \sigma_{j+1,j-1} & \sigma_{j+1,j} & \sigma_{j+1,j+1} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{[2]}{[4]} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{[2]}{[2j][2j+1]} & * & * \\ -\sqrt{\frac{[2j-1]}{[2j+1]}} \frac{q^{2j+1}+q^{-2j-1}}{[2j]} & \frac{2+q^{4j+2}+q^{-4j-2}}{[2j][2j+2]} & * \\ -\frac{\sqrt{[2j-1][2j+3]}}{[2j+1]} & \sqrt{\frac{[2j+3]}{[2j+1]}} \frac{q^{2j+1}+q^{-2j-1}}{[2j+2]} & \left(1 - \frac{[2]}{[2j+1][2j+2]}\right) \end{pmatrix},$$

where the matrices are symmetric, $q = e^{\frac{i\pi}{k+2}}$,

$$[x] = \frac{q^x - q^{-x}}{q - q^{-1}}, \tag{9.26}$$

and $P^2 = 1 - P^0 - P^1$. Here a,d and j stands for the isospin of the primary fields and are in the range $0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \ldots, \frac{k}{2}$.

From these projection operators we find,

$$\lambda = \zeta_0 = \pi(\Delta_1 - \Delta_0)/2 = \frac{\pi}{k+2}, \tag{9.27}$$

and

$$\zeta_1 = \pi(\Delta_2 - \Delta_1)/2 = \frac{\pi}{2}\frac{2\cdot 3 - 1\cdot 2}{2(k+2)} = \frac{\pi}{k+2} = 2\zeta_0. \tag{9.28}$$

Substituting into eq. (10) we find the face transfer matrix,

$$X_i(u) = P^0 \cdot \sin(\zeta_0 + u)\sin(\zeta_1 + u) + P^1 \cdot \sin(\zeta_0 + u)\sin(\zeta_1 - u) + P^2 \sin(\zeta_0 - u)\sin(\zeta_1 - u). \tag{9.29}$$

It can be explicitly checked, involving numerous relations among the matrix elements, that the crossing property, eq. (20), which is a powerful constraint, is indeed obeyed, where the S matrix is the usual one for $SU(2)$, eq. (22), with $p = 1$. Indeed, P^0 is given entirely by eq. (20). Similarly P^2 and P^1, are almost (but not completely) determined by eq. (20).

The face transfer matrix $X_i(u)$, eq. (27), derived here by specializing the universal eq. (10), is identical to the trigonometric solutions of the YBE equation previously found in ref. [7], for this particular case [73]. Similarly, all the solutions of the YBE based on various quantum groups are special cases of eq. (10), as applied to the corresponding WZNW model. This includes a host of models studied in literature (for a review, see, e.g., [3]).

10. Fusion Soliton Theories

Consider a soliton or kink system based on some fusion IRF model. The solitons are labeled by some primary fields in the theory, h, v, p, etc. The vacua of the theory are also labeled by the primary fields, where each primary field, a, corresponds to a unique vacua. The h solitons interpolate between any two vacua a and b in the theory, such that the fusion coefficient N_{ha}^{b} does not vanish. The two particle scattering amplitude for the solitons h and v is described by the process $(a|h|b)+(b|v|d)\to(a|v|c)+(c|h|d)$, where $(a|h|b)$ stands for the h soliton interpolating between the a and b vacua, and so forth. We denote this scattering amplitude by

$$S_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle|\theta\right), \tag{10.1}$$

where $i\pi\theta$ is the relative rapidity of the two incoming particles, fig. (10.1). Here, a,b,c and d label the different admissible pairs, which obey, $N_{ha}^{b}N_{hc}^{d}N_{va}^{c}N_{vb}^{d}>0$.

The S matrix of any such theory (regardless of whether it corresponds to a fusion of RCFT) needs to have the following properties.

Regularity, which expresses the absence of scattering at zero relative rapidity:

$$S_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle|0\right)=\delta_{b,c}. \tag{10.2}$$

Unitarity:

$$\sum_{e}S_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} b & c \\ a & e \end{matrix}\middle|\theta\right)S_{\bar{v},\bar{h}}\left(\begin{matrix} e & c \\ a & d \end{matrix}\middle|-\theta\right)=\delta_{b,d}. \tag{10.3}$$

Crossing symmetry:

$$S_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle|\theta\right)=S_{v,\bar{h}}\left(\begin{matrix} b & d \\ a & c \end{matrix}\middle|1-\theta\right)=S_{\bar{v},h}\left(\begin{matrix} c & a \\ d & b \end{matrix}\middle|1-\theta\right). \tag{10.4}$$

Charge conjugation,

$$S_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ d & c \end{matrix}\middle|\theta\right) = S_{\bar{h},\bar{v}}\left(\begin{matrix} d & c \\ b & a \end{matrix}\middle|\theta\right)^{*}. \tag{10.5}$$

Time reversal,

$$S_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle|\theta\right) = S_{v,h}\left(\begin{matrix} a & c \\ b & d \end{matrix}\middle|\theta\right). \tag{10.6}$$

In addition, for an integrable scattering theory the S matrix must obey the factorization equation (YBE) [4, 3],

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{g} S_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ f & g \end{matrix}\middle|\theta\right) S_{p,v}\left(\begin{matrix} f & g \\ e & d \end{matrix}\middle|\theta+\phi\right) S_{p,h}\left(\begin{matrix} g & b \\ d & c \end{matrix}\middle|\phi\right) = \\ \sum_{g} S_{p,h}\left(\begin{matrix} f & a \\ e & g \end{matrix}\middle|\phi\right) S_{p,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ g & c \end{matrix}\middle|\theta+\phi\right) S_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} g & c \\ e & d \end{matrix}\middle|\theta\right),\end{aligned} \tag{10.7}$$

which is depicted in fig. (10.2). Note that the factorization equation (7) is identical to the STE relation for the corresponding IRF model eq. (7.3), and that fig. (10.2) is dual to the STE fig. (7.2), by replacing each of the vacua domains by a vertex, and connecting the vacua if and only if a soliton interpolates between them. Thus an S matrix which satisfies the factorization equation is a Boltzmann weight for a solvable lattice model. Our purpose is to build the S matrix from the IRF Boltzmann weights described in sections (7,8,9). Thus, we relist here the properties of the Boltzmann weights, denoted as before by $w_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle|u\right)$.

Regularity:

$$w_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle|0\right) = \sqrt{\rho(0)}\delta_{b,d}, \tag{10.8}$$

Unitarity:

$$\sum_{e} w_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} b & c \\ a & e \end{matrix}\middle|u\right) w_{\bar{v},\bar{h}}\left(\begin{matrix} e & c \\ a & d \end{matrix}\middle|-u\right) = \rho_{h,v}(u)\delta_{b,d}. \tag{10.9}$$

Crossing symmetry:

$$w_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) = \left(\frac{\psi(a)\psi(d)}{\psi(b)\psi(c)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{v,\bar{h}}\left(\begin{matrix} b & d \\ a & c \end{matrix}\middle| \lambda - u\right) . \tag{10.10}$$

Charge conjugation and time reversal:

$$w_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ d & c \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) = w_{\bar{h},\bar{v}}\left(\begin{matrix} d & c \\ b & a \end{matrix}\middle| u\right)^{*} = w_{v,h}\left(\begin{matrix} a & c \\ b & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) . \tag{10.11}$$

The parameter $\rho_{h,v}(u)$ is called the unitarity factor. λ is the crossing parameter, and $\psi(a)$ is the crossing multiplier. For a graph–state IRF model we found that $\psi(a)$ is an eigenvalue of the connectivity matrix and $\lambda = 2\cos(\lambda)$ is the eigenvalue. For a fusion IRF model $\mathrm{IRF}(\mathcal{O}, h, \bar{h})$ we have the universal crossing multiplier $\psi(a) = S_{a,1}/S_{h,1}$, where S denotes the toroidal modular function, eq. (9.20). For an IRF model based on a two block product $hv = \psi_1 + \psi_2$ we have from sect. (7),

$$w_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| u\right) = \delta_{b,c}\sin(\lambda - u) + \sin u \cdot R_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\right) , \tag{10.12}$$

where $R_{h,v}$ is the Hecke algebra element, eq. (7.29), and where λ is the crossing parameter, $\lambda = \pi(\Delta_2 - \Delta_1)/2$, where Δ_i are the dimension of the fields in hv product, and which depend on the choice of fields h and v. The generalization of the Boltzmann weight eq. (12) to more than two blocks is described by eqs. (9.10, 9.13). The unitarity factor is given by eq. (9.25) We take the following general ansatz for the S matrix,

$$S_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| \theta\right) = F_{h,v}(\theta)\left[\frac{\psi(b)\psi(c)}{\psi(a)\psi(d)}\right]^{\theta/2} w_{h,v}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| \eta_{h,v}\lambda_{h,v}\theta\right) , \tag{10.13}$$

where $\lambda_{h,v}$ is the crossing parameter in this channel, η is some parameter, to be determined, and $F_{h,v}(\theta)$ is an overall function.

Evidently, S obeys all the properties listed, except possibly, for crossing and unitarity. In particular, the factorization equation, eq. (7), which is a consequence of the STE is obeyed by the Boltzmann weights (as long as we keep $\eta_{h,v}\lambda_{h,v}$ fixed for all h and v, which will be assumed), which by itself is a consequence of the Hexagon identity obeyed by the conformal braiding matrix, eq. (7.13). Unitarity and crossing, will be achieved by properly setting the parameters $\eta_{h,v}$ and the functions $F_{h,v}(\theta)$.

Let us first assume that the field $h = v = x$ is a real field, $x = \bar{x}$, and that this is a two block case, $x^2 = \psi_1 + \psi_2$. This applies to all the graph–state models, as well as all RCFT with a real fundamental field. Setting in this case, $\eta = 1$ and $\lambda = \lambda_{x,x} = \pi p/q$, where p and q are some strange integers. We find that unitarity and crossing hold provided that the function $F(\theta) = F_{x,x}(\theta)$ obeys

$$\begin{aligned} F(1-\theta) &= F(\theta), \\ F(\theta)F(-\theta) &= \frac{1}{\sin[\lambda(1-\theta)]\sin[\lambda(1+\theta)]}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.14}$$

The system of equations (14) can be solved for any rational λ/π giving a universal minimal* solution $F_\lambda(\theta)$. Note that for an RCFT, indeed $\lambda/\pi = \frac{\Delta_1 - \Delta_2}{2}$ and is thus a rational number. To present a closed form solution for $F(\theta)$ we need to distinguish the cases, where q is odd, or q is even. For odd q we find the minimal solution,

$$F(\theta)^{-1} = \sin[\lambda(1+\theta)] \prod_{m=2}^{(q-1)/2} \frac{\sin[\lambda(m-(-1)^m\theta)]}{\sin[\lambda(m+(-1)^m\theta)]}. \tag{10.15}$$

To write the solution for an even q in a closed form, we define the special function $H(z)$ by

$$H(z) = \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{\left(1-\frac{z}{2m}\right)^{2m}\left(1+\frac{z}{2m-1}\right)^{2m-1}}{\left(1+\frac{z}{2m}\right)^{2m}\left(1-\frac{z}{2m-1}\right)^{2m-1}} \right]. \tag{10.16}$$

It can be checked that the terms appearing in this product are of the form $1 + \alpha(z)/m^2 + O(m^{-3})$, and thus the product converges absolutely for any z which is

---

$\star$ The minimality here denotes least number of zero and poles in the strip $0 \le \mathrm{Re}\ \theta < 2$.

not an integer. Thus, the special function $H(z)$ is a holomorphic function, whose only poles and zeros in the complex plane are for an integer z. The order of the zero at $z = N$ is N for an even N, and $-N$ for an odd one, with the convention that a zero of order $-k$ is a pole of order k. It can be checked that $H(z)$ obeys the functional equations,

$$\begin{aligned} H(z)H(-z) &= 1, \\ \frac{H(1-z)}{H(z)} &= \tan\left(\frac{\pi z}{2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{10.17}$$

Now, the function $F(\theta)$ for $\lambda = 2\pi p/q$, even q, becomes

$$F(\theta) = H(\pi\theta)^{-2p/q} \prod_{m=1}^{q-1} \sin[\lambda(\theta - m)]^{(-1)^m p_m p/q}, \tag{10.18}$$

where the integers p_m are defined by,

$$p_m = q s_m - 2m, \qquad s_m = \begin{cases} 0 & m = 0 \\ 1 & 1 \le m < q-1 \\ 2 & m = q-1 \end{cases}. \tag{10.19}$$

Note that $F(\theta)$ is a holomorphic function with no branch lines (or 'cuts') with poles and zeros only for $z = \pi m$, where m is some integer.

Note now that we may multiply the minimal solution, eq. (15,18), by any solution of the homogeneous equation

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\theta)Q(-\theta) &= 1, \\ Q(\theta) &= Q(\lambda - \theta), \end{aligned} \tag{10.20}$$

and, still, eq. (14) holds. The general solution to eq. (20) is

$$Q(\theta) = \frac{h(\theta)}{h(-\theta)} \, \frac{h(\lambda - \theta)}{h(\lambda + \theta)}, \tag{10.21}$$

where h is any holomorphic function. Such a solution $Q(\theta)$ is termed a 'CDD' ambiguity, and it needs to be determined, for the full S matrix to be found.

The only way to determine, with any confidence, the CDD factor, eq. (21), is by some additional physical input. (In the literature, more often than not, this is done by trial and error on conjectured S matrices). In particular, we may use the soliton bound state content, along with the known masses of the solitons, eq. (3.11), to find the poles of $F(\theta)$ in the physical sheet $0 \leq \theta < 1$. Such poles correspond to bound states of the scattered particles, whose mass is

$$M_B^2 = M_h^2 + M_v^2 - 2M_h M_v \cos\left(\pi\theta\right), \tag{10.22}$$

where M_u, M_v and M_B are the masses of the h and v solitons, along with their bound states, denoted by B. The equation (22), along with the known solitonic spectrum, determines all the physical poles in the regime $0 \leq \text{Re}\ \theta < 1$. Further, for the fundamental solitons, we expect no higher order poles, as these correspond to higher order scattering processes. Thus, we form a complete knowledge of the poles in the physical sheet $0 \leq \text{Re}\ \theta < 1$. These are allowed only for $\text{Im}\ \theta = 0$, and then only for the values given by eq. (22). For a unitary theory, the residues at the poles must be positive. For non–fundamental solitons, the residues can be calculated using diagrams involving the constituent solitons.

Equipped with this knowledge, we may proceed to determine the suitable function $h(\theta)$ up to such $Q(\theta)$'s which have no zero or poles in the physical domain $0 \leq \text{Re}\ \theta < 1$. Such Q's are called Z-factors, and will always be assumed to be equal to one, unless otherwise specified.

We may multiply, the solution $F_\lambda(\theta)$ by the suitable $Q(\theta)$, in such a way as to remove all the poles from the physical sheet. This resulting solution is termed the strictly minimal solution. For $\lambda = \frac{\pi}{q}$, the solutions eq. (15) and (18) are strictly minimal. For $\lambda = \frac{2\pi p}{q}$, where $p > 1$, we need to use a non-trivial h, which is easily found to be of the form,

$$h(\theta) = \prod_i \sin(\lambda\mu_i - \theta), \tag{10.23}$$

where μ_i are parameters specifying for the location of the poles of $F_\lambda(\theta)$ on the physical sheet, which come in pairs at μ_i and $1-\mu_i$, as follows from the crossing symmetry, eq. (4). Thus, at last, determining the complete S matrix.

For, example, in all soliton theories based on state-graph IRF models, we expect no bound states for the fundamental solitons. Hence, the full S matrix is given by the strictly minimal solution, eq. (13).

Now, note that we have chosen the value of $\eta = 1$. However other values may be valid as well. Albeit, these correspond to choices of different RCFT, which have the same fusion rules. As explained in sections (4,5), each set of fusion rules lead to a number of different RCFT. The parameter η can be set equal to one, *always*, provided that we build the Boltzmann weights around all the possible RCFT's with the given set of fusion rules. For example, $SU(2)_3$ can be replaced by $SU(2)_{3/4}$, giving two different S matrices, with the same exact solitonic content. Which of all these choices correspond to the actual $N = 2$ supersymmetric field theory we are interested in? Usually, one may use charge conjugation, eq. (5), to eliminate all choices of the RCFT (for a real particle), by demanding that S is real. However, there are some very rare instances where an ambiguity remains, and cannot be dispelled without additional physical input. In fact, the Hard hexagon model, which is based on the RCFT $SU(2)_3/SU(2)_{1/3}$, as discussed in section (8), example (c), has such an ambiguity, since the RCFT $SU(2)_{3/4}/SU(2)_{4/3}$ equally well leads to real Boltzmann weights along with the same fusion rules. The first S matrix was proposed in ref. [74], while the other was suggested in ref. [75]. Both are correct S matrices, but they correspond to different physical systems. In general, these ambiguities can be resolved only with an additional physical input⋆.

Let us turn, now, to soliton scattering amplitudes in non–real fusion theories. Consider the fundamental soliton of the theory, labeled by the primary field p, and

---

⋆ In this particular example, both S matrices were suggested to describe the $\phi_{2,1}$ perturbation of the tri–critical Ising model. It is still not resolved which is the correct one for this specific theory, though some support for the S matrix of ref. [75] was reported in ref. [76].

assume for simplicity that this is the two block case,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_p^2 &= \psi_1 + \psi_2,\\ \psi_p \psi_{\bar{p}} &= 1 + \psi_3,\end{aligned} \tag{10.24}$$

where ψ_i denotes the respective primary fields, and the product is in the fusion ring sense. Now, there are two different crossing parameters we can define, in accordance with the theory of section (7). These are

$$\lambda = \frac{\pi \Delta_3}{2}, \qquad \tilde{\lambda} = \frac{\pi(\Delta_2 - \Delta_1)}{2}, \tag{10.25}$$

where Δ_i denotes, as before, the dimensions of the primary fields. Now, we have four different soliton scattering amplitudes, $S_{p,p}$, $S_{p,\bar{p}}$, $S_{\bar{p},p}$ and $S_{\bar{p},\bar{p}}$ to consider. These are related via the crossing and charge conjugation, eq. (4,5), to the basic amplitude $S_{p,p}$ but need to obey four different factorization equations, eq. (7). Note that for amplitudes involving $S_{p,\bar{p}}$ and $S_{\bar{p},p}$ the YBE no longer holds and it is modified to a quadratic relation. It follows that the general Hecke ansatz holds only for the $S_{p,p} = S^*_{\bar{p},\bar{p}}$ amplitudes. For $S_{p,p}$ we adopt the same ansatz as before, eq. (13),

$$S_{p,p}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| \theta\right) = F(\theta)\left(\frac{S_{b,0}S_{c,0}}{S_{a,0}S_{d,0}}\right)^{\theta/2} w_{p,p}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| \eta\theta\right), \tag{10.26}$$

where $S_{a,b}$ is the usual toroidal modular matrix, $F(\theta)$ is the unitarizing factor that needs to be determined, and the Boltzmann weight w is given by the usual fusion IRF Hecke ansatz, eq. (7.31),

$$w_{p,p}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| \theta\right) = \sin[\tilde{\lambda} - \lambda\theta)]\delta_{b,c} + \sin(\lambda\theta) H \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10.27}$$

and we absorbed the crossing multiplier into the definition of the rapidity. Again, we may assume $\eta = 1^\dagger$. H is the Hecke algebra element associated to the braiding

---

† The reason for it, as before, that different values of η correspond to different choices of RCFT's which have the same fusion rules, and thus with no loss of generality we may take $\eta = 1$, along with choosing a different RCFT.

matrix $B_{p,p}$, and is defined by equation (7.29). From the discussion of section (7), it follows that w, and consequently also S, obey the YBE, eq. (7.32). The other amplitudes can now be determined by the crossing symmetry, eq. (4), where the only new amplitude is $S_{p,\bar{p}}$, due to charge conjugation. Using crossing, we find,

$$S_{p,\bar{p}}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{matrix}\middle| \theta\right) = S_{p,p}\left(\begin{matrix} c & a \\ d & b \end{matrix}\middle| 1-\theta\right). \tag{10.28}$$

It remains to verify that the modified YBE, eq. (7) holds with this ansatz, and that indeed the modular matrix, again corresponds to the crossing multiplier. In other words, we need the highly non–trivial modified YBE,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_g S_{p,\bar{p}}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ f & g \end{matrix}\middle| \theta\right) S_{p,\bar{p}}\left(\begin{matrix} f & g \\ e & d \end{matrix}\middle| \theta+\phi\right) S_{p,p}\left(\begin{matrix} g & b \\ d & c \end{matrix}\middle| \phi\right) = \\ \sum_g S_{p,p}\left(\begin{matrix} f & a \\ e & g \end{matrix}\middle| \phi\right) S_{p,\bar{p}}\left(\begin{matrix} a & b \\ g & c \end{matrix}\middle| \theta+\phi\right) S_{p,\bar{p}}\left(\begin{matrix} g & c \\ e & d \end{matrix}\middle| \theta\right).\end{aligned} \tag{10.29}$$

It can be shown, that indeed, eq. (29) holds with the ansatz eq. (26). The proof, which is rather involved, follows from the duality properties of RCFT and will be described in the sequel to this paper, ref. [1]. The other modified YBE relations follow immediately from eq. (29) and charge conjugation. Note that $S_{p,\bar{p}}$ is *not* of the general Hecke ansatz, as it is not a solution of the YBE, but the modified relation eq. (29). However, for any number of blocks, it remains of the form eq. (9.10), expressed in terms of the same projector operators, albeit with a different set of eigenvalue functions $f_a(\theta)$, which can be deduced from the crossing property eq. (9.20). More detail will be provided in ref. in [1]. Now, the only remaining non–trivial properties that need to be checked is the unitarity, eq. (3), which is implemented by a judicious choice of the function $F(\theta)$. Unitarity holds provided that $F(\theta)$ obeys

$$\begin{aligned} F(1-\theta)F(1+\theta) &= [\sin\lambda(1-\theta)\sin\lambda(1+\theta)]^{-1} \\ F(\theta)F(-\theta) &= \sin[\tilde{\lambda}-\lambda\theta]^{-1}\sin[\tilde{\lambda}+\lambda\theta]^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.30}$$

This set of equations can be solved for any λ and $\tilde{\lambda}$. It is convenient to parametrize the crossing parameters via the variables n an k,

$$\lambda = \frac{\pi n}{2(n+k)}, \qquad \tilde{\lambda} = \frac{\pi}{n+k}, \tag{10.31}$$

which are arbitrary real numbers, which will be termed the "rank" and the "level", respectively. (In RCFT the rank and the level are, of course, always rational). The minimal solution to the set of equations (30), can be found in a closed form, as in the real case eqs. (15,18), via pole counting. For brevity sake, we omit the detail. Alternatively, $F(\theta)$ may be written as

$$F(\theta) = a_n(\theta) f_{n,k}(\theta), \tag{10.32}$$

where $f_{n,k}(\theta)$ has no poles in the physical sheet, $0 \leq \mathrm{Re}\ \theta < 1$, and is given by the expression

$$\begin{aligned} f_{n,k}(u) = \exp\Bigg(2\int_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{x}\, \frac{\mathrm{sh}(nux/2)}{\mathrm{sh}[(k+n)x]\,\mathrm{sh}(nx)}\big\{\mathrm{ch}(kx)\mathrm{ch}(nxu/2) - \qquad (10.33) \\ \mathrm{ch}[(n+k-2)x]\mathrm{ch}[nx(u/2-1)]\big\}\Bigg), \end{aligned}$$

where as $a_n(u)$ is the Koberle Swieca scattering matrix [34], of the $\hat{A}_n$ type,

$$a_n(u) = \frac{\sin\pi\left(\frac{u}{2}+\frac{1}{n}\right)}{\sin\pi\left(\frac{u}{2}-\frac{1}{n}\right)}. \tag{10.34}$$

All the poles in the physical sheet are contained in $a_n(u)$, while $f_{n,k}(u)$ has no poles or zeros in the physical sheet. Thus in the *p*-*p* channel there is a unique bound state, whose mass is given by, using eq. (3.11),

$$m_2 = 2m_1\cos(\frac{\pi}{n}) = 2m_1\cos(\frac{2\pi\lambda}{\tilde{\lambda}}). \tag{10.35}$$

The rest of the amplitudes are found by the fusion procedure of IRF, or the bootstrap of the soliton amplitudes as in refs. [55, 56].

Let us exemplify the foregoing discussion with the $SU(n)_k$ fusion soliton theory. The Hecke algebra elements were given in section (8), example (f). The two crossing parameters are readily calculated using the dimension formula, eq. (4.22),

$$\lambda = \frac{\pi}{n+k}, \qquad \tilde{\lambda} = \frac{\pi n}{2(n+k)}, \tag{10.36}$$

i.e., n is identified with the 'rank' an 'k' with the level, as defined in eq. (31). Further, the modular matrix element $S_{\lambda,0}/S_{0,0}$ is the quantum dimension of the representation λ, and may be expressed by a quantum Weyl formula (This holds for all the groups; see, e.g, [53]),

$$\frac{S_{\lambda,0}}{S_{0,0}} = \prod_{\alpha>0} \frac{[(\lambda+\rho,\alpha)]}{[(\rho,\alpha)]}, \tag{10.37}$$

where we defined $[x] = \sin(\frac{\pi x}{n+k})$, the product ranges over all the positive roots α, and ρ is the usual half the sum of the positive roots. At $n+k \to \infty$ the quantum dimension becomes the usual dimension of the representation λ, while eq. (37) becomes the usual Weyl's dimension formula. The bound states of the theory are the solitons corresponding to the level one (i.e., fully anti–symmetric) representations, $p_t = \lambda_t$, $t = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$, and where λ_t are the fundamental weights. The masses of the solitons, are given by the usual Koberle–Swieca relation,

$$M_t = m \sin\left(\frac{\pi t}{n}\right), \tag{10.38}$$

where m is the mass scale of the theory. The relevant part of the S matrix, i.e., the part that has poles in the physical sheet, which are the analogues of the $a_n(u)$ piece for all the amplitudes, is given by the usual $\hat{A}_n$ Toda S matrices, see for example ref. [57]. Note now that this mass spectrum agrees precisely with the one derived from the LG potential, eq. (3.11), for this particular case, where the potential V

is given by [8]

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i^{n+k}, \tag{10.39}$$

written in terms of the anti–symmetric functions

$$x_t = \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_n} q_{i_1} q_{i_2} \ldots q_{i_n}, \tag{10.40}$$

which correspond to the fully anti–symmetric representations, along with the constraint $x_n = 1$. Substituting into eq. (3.11), we recover the mass formula eq. (38), which was previously conjectured in ref. [29]*.

The scattering matrices described, in the above $SU(n)_k$ example, agree precisely with those previously derived in ref. [77], using the lattice IRF models of ref. [7], where it was suggested to describe the perturbations of the W invariant coset model $\frac{G_k \times G_1}{G_{k+1}}$, as perturbed by the operator $\Phi_{\text{ad}}^{0,0}$, where $\Phi_{\lambda_3}^{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}$ denotes the highest weights of G_k, G_1 and G_{k+1}, respectively, using the usual coset notation. Alternatively the theory can be described as the W algebra symmetric theory, $W(A_n)$, ref. [78]. For $k = 1$ all the factors drop, and the S matrix is given just by $a_n(u)$, and thus coincides precisely with the $\hat{A}_n$ matrices. For any k, the spectrum relevant part of the amplitude is given by the $k = 1$ amplitude, $a_n(u)$. The same holds for the potentials eq. (2.1), which are described by the very same $\hat{A}_n$ scattering matrices, for any k, times an 'irrelevant' (i.e., no bound states) IRF piece, which depends on k.

Note that we may build a more general S matrix by choosing the RCFT $SU(N)_{k/p}$ instead (c.f. section (5)). This amounts to replacing $(n + k)$ with $(n + k)/p$ everywhere, and no other changes. However, for a general p the resulting amplitudes violate charge conjugation symmetry, as they are complex.

$\star$ Curiously, this mass spectrum is identical to the one found for the class of potentials, eq. (2.1), which was discussed in section (3), M_{rs} given after eq. (3.11). The reason for this coincidence is that the spectrum does not depend on the level k, and for $k = 1$ the two potentials give the same RCFT field theory, and hence also, the same soliton scattering theory (see the example at the end of section (3), and the footnote there).

The only allowable values are $p = \pm 1$. Albeit, we may use the duality relation $SU(n)_k \approx SU(k)_{-n}$, to assume that $p = 1$ always. (Where the choice $p = -1$ gives the dual amplitudes of $SU(k)_n$; see the footnote after eq. (2.40).)

Thus, we, indeed, see a one to one correspondence between fusion LG theories and their associated scattering matrices, pinning down a unique RCFT with the given set of fusion rules, for each such LG theory. The actual S matrices of the $N = 2$ supersymmetric theory are a tensor product with a trivial factor, which accounts for the doubling of the solitons, and is independent of k. This will be reported, in general, in ref. [1]. Examples of such factors, and S matrices, were already conjectured in refs. [79, 80, 29].

The arguments above can be generalied straightforwardly to the case of more than two blocks. The Boltzmann weights are built as described in section (9). The only essential modification is in the unitarity equation, which assumes the form, (for simplicity, we take the primary field p to be real; the variation for the non–real case is analogous, and is omitted for brevity),

$$\begin{aligned} F(v)F(-v) &= \prod_i \left[\sin(\lambda_i - \lambda v)\sin(\lambda_i + \lambda v)\right]^{-1}, \\ F(v) &= F(1 - v), \end{aligned} \tag{10.41}$$

where i ranges over the primary fields in the product, and where λ_i and λ are the relevant crossing parameters. (given in section (9), eqs. (9.14), where $\lambda_i = \zeta_i$, and $\lambda = \zeta_0$ is the crossing parameter), and where we have used also eq. (9.24) (unitarity). The solution to this set of equations is

$$F(v) = \prod_i f_i(v), \tag{10.42}$$

where the functions $f_i(v)$ obey

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(v)f_i(-v) &= \left[\sin(\lambda_i - \lambda v)\sin(\lambda_i + \lambda v)\right]^{-1}, \\ f_i(v) &= f_i(1 - v), \end{aligned} \tag{10.43}$$

and can be solved in a closed form, in analogy with eqs. (15,18), for rational crossing parameters.

As an example, one finds in this way the scattering matrices associated to $IRF(SU(2),[2],[2])$ which are given by substituting the Boltzmann weights eq. (9.27). The unitarity equation, eq. (41), becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} F(v)F(-v) &= [\sin\lambda(1+v)\sin\lambda(1-v)\sin\lambda(2-v)\sin\lambda(2+v)]^{-1}, \\ F(v) &= F(1-v). \end{aligned} \tag{10.44}$$

Assuming an odd level, $\lambda = \pi p/q$, where q is the level of $SU(2)$, and $\gcd(p, 2q) = 1$, we find that

$$F(v) = f_1(v) f_2(v), \tag{10.45}$$

where

$$f_1(v)^{-1} = \sin[\lambda(1+v)] \prod_{m=2}^{(q-1)/2} \frac{\sin[\lambda(m-(-1)^m v)]}{\sin[\lambda(m+(-1)^m v)]} \tag{10.46}$$

(from eq. (15)), along with

$$f_2(v)^{-1} = \sin[\lambda(2+v)] \prod_{m=2}^{(q-3)/2} \frac{\sin[\lambda(m+1-(-1)^m v)]}{\sin[\lambda(m+1+(-1)^m v)]}. \tag{10.47}$$

The reader is urged to complete the case of even q, as an exercise. We expect no bound states for this soliton theory. Charge conjugation, for $SU(2)$ implies that $p = \pm 1$. The solution eqs. (45-47), is then strictly minimal, indicating that there are, indeed, no bound states.

This concludes the description of the general soliton scattering theory, and their scattering amplitudes. In particular, we find the S matrices of all the integrable $N = 2$ supersymmetric field theories, which are constructed from their corresponding rational conformal field theories. It is noteworthy that all the known examples of soliton scattering theories studied in the literature are of the form eq. (26), and conform to this universal expression. Thus, the discussion in this paper gives a unified framework for all integrable soliton systems, mapping them uniquely to rational conformal field theories. This completes the circle of categorical isomorphisms put forward in the introduction, section (1), for all the four systems described there.

11. Discussion

The theme threaded throughout this paper is the interrelationship between rational conformal field theories, integrable $N = 2$ scalar field theories ('Landau Ginzburg') and Interaction round the face lattice models. The correspondence found here between these three very different physical problems drives us to the conclusion that in effect these are equivalent systems and leading, also, to a cross fertilization of ideas in these much investigated subjects.

The first step, in this correspondence, is the realization that fusion rings of rational conformal field theories give rise to integrable $N = 2$ scalar field theory models, whose super–potential is the fusion potential of the RCFT. This correspondence need not be limited to LG theories, but one may simply postulate an $N = 2$ supersymmetric field theory, whose chiral algebra is identical to the fusion ring of any given RCFT. The question of whether this fusion ring is described by a potential, and thus maps to an $N = 2$ superconformal scalar field theory, then becomes only a technical issue. It follows that we can cover all supersymmetric integrable models and all RCFT by this picture. The ground state vacua of the resulting LG theory are given by the extrema points of the fusion potentials, which are labeled by the primary fields. The solitons of the theory interpolate between these different primary field vacua. The exact solitonic content may be deduced through a calculation of the metric in moduli space. We find that the solitons are labeled by some fundamental primary fields, and that the admissibility condition of having two vacua connected by a given soliton is whether or not their respective fusion coefficient vanishes. Thus we are naturally led to considering integrable soliton systems described by the fusion rules of any RCFT. The S matrices of the soliton systems are closely related to the Boltzmann weights of fusion interaction round the face lattice models. We build the Boltzmann weights from the conformal braiding matrix of the RCFT, thus getting a direct link between RCFT and fusion IRF.

The soliton systems S matrices are of the form

$$S\begin{pmatrix} a & b & \bigg| u \\ c & d & \bigg| \end{pmatrix} = F(u)\left(\frac{S_{b,0}S_{c,0}}{S_{a,0}S_{d,0}}\right)^{u/2} w\begin{pmatrix} a & b & \bigg| \eta u \\ c & d & \bigg| \end{pmatrix}, \tag{11.1}$$

where a,b,c and d are primary fields labeling the vacua, $S_{a,b}$ is the conformal modular matrix and the Boltzmann weights are built in terms of the conformal braiding matrix R as explained in sections (7,8,9). The factor $F(u)$ is needed for unitarity, and is determined by the unitarizability property of the Boltzmann weights, eq. (10.9). The power part is needed to ensure crossing symmetry of the scattering amplitudes. Together, crossing and unitarity, uniquely determine the S matrix, including the parameter η, up to CDD ambiguities, as explained in section (10). The actual $N = 2$ amplitude includes also a tensor with a trivial S matrix which comes from supersymmetry. Without this factor, the above minimal S matrix corresponds to different physical problems.

Now, one might ponder the direct relation between the RCFT and its corresponding IRF model. What is, for example, the critical structure of the IRF lattice models, and in particular, do the fixed points give back the same RCFT we started from? There is a strong indication that this is in fact the case, though more study of these new IRF models is required. If so, then we have actually solved also the reconstruction 'fantasy' problem of RCFT [52, 62]. Starting only from the conformal data on the sphere, we build the IRF model based on the conformal braiding matrix. The fixed points of the lattice model then give the full conformal field theory realizations of the original data we started from. Thus, going through the fusion IRF models, reconstruction of RCFT is no longer a fantasy, but a well defined technical procedure. Work along this lines will be reported in ref. [1]. The solitons systems described here would then apply to off critical limits of the RCFT, in the appropriate regime in parameter space.

The fusion IRF construction gives us a novel and powerful way to build integrable lattice models satisfying the star triangle equation. It turns out that all the known integrable IRF models with second order phase transition point are, in fact, fusion IRF theories. We can thus directly apply conformal field theory ideas in the solutions of lattice models away from criticality. There is a complete parallelism of language and tools here. The bootstrap of soliton systems is identical to the fusion of IRF models, which itself is equivalent to the fusion of fields in conformal field theory. The soliton creation operators $K_a(u)$ reduce in the critical limit to the chiral vertex operators, and so on.

A number of standing calculations will be reported elsewhere, to further support this picture. One is the thermodynamic Bethe ansatz calculation of the soliton systems, which will verify that these are indeed the correct soliton systems. Another, is the general metric calculation for fusion superconformal field theories, which is another method for deriving the solitonic content. These issues will be addressed in the forthcoming publication ref. [1].

Finally, we see here a myriad of distinct connections between what has previously been thought of as distinct systems. Though there are still some missing pieces of the puzzle, we hope that a unified picture of rational two dimensional quantum field theory starts to emerge on the canvas.

Acknowledgements: I am indebted to L. Alvarez–Gaumé, V. Bazhanov, C. Gomez, A. Schwimmer and A.B. Zamolodchikov for interesting discussions and to J. Schwarz for remarks on the manuscript. I thank the theory division of CERN and the physics department of Rockefeller University where part of this work was done, and the organizers of the lake Como Conference on integrable systems (September 1992) for the opportunity to describe it.

Tiger, Tiger, burning bright
In the forest of the night
What immortal hand or eye
Could frame thy fearful symmetry?

— William Blake

REFERENCES

1. D. Gepner, On the structure of rational field theory, II, in preparation
2. R.J. Baxter, “Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics”, Academic Press, London, England, 1982
3. M. Wadati, T. Deguchi and Y. Akutsu, Physics Reports 180 (4&5) (1989) 247, and ref. therein
4. A.B. Zamolodchikov and Al. B Zamolodchikov, Annals of Physics 120 (1979) 253
5. P. Fendley and P. Ginsparg, Nucl.Phys. B324 (1989) 549
6. J.B. Zuber and P. Di Francesco, Nucl.Phys. B338 (1990) 602
7. M. Jimbo, T. Miwa and M. Okado, Lett. Math. Phys. 14 (1987) 123
8. D. Gepner, Comm. Math. Phys. 141 (1991) 381
9. C. Vafa and S. Cecotti, Nucl. Phys. B367 (1991) 359
10. Y. Kazama and H. Suzuki, Nucl. Phys. B321 (1989) 232
11. W. Lerche and N.P. Warner, Nucl. Phys. B358 (1990) 571
12. P. Fendley, W. Lerche, S.D. Mathur and N.P. Warner, Nucl. Phys. B348 (1991) 66
13. P. Fendley and K. Intriligator, Nucl. Phys. B380 (1992) 265; Nucl. Phys. B 372 (1991) 533
14. H. Hiller, “Geometry of Coxeter groups”, Pitman, London, 1982
15. G.E. Andrews, Theory of partitions, Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications, Vol. 2, (1976).
16. E. Witten, Comm. Math. Phys. 92 (1984) 455
17. V.G. Knizhnik and A.B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. B247 (1984) 83
18. D. Gepner and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B278 (1986) 493

19. E. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. B300 (1988) 360

20. P. Griffiths and J. Harris, “Principles of algebraic geometry”, New–York, Wiley, 1978

21. D. Gepner, Comm. Math. Phys. 142 (1991) 433

22. D. Gonzales and A.N. Redlich, Nucl. Phys. B256 (1985) 621

23. I. Affleck, Nucl. Phys. B265 [FS15] 409; 448

24. E.J. Mlawer, S.G. Naulich, H.A. Riggs, H.J. Schnitzer, Nucl. Phys. B352 (1991) 863

25. A.B. Zamolodchikov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 441 (1987) 529

26. E. Martinec, Phys. Lett. 217B (1989) 431

27. N.P. Warner and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B324 (1989) 371

28. D. Gepner, Nucl. Phys. B322 (1989) 65

29. D. Gepner and A. Schwimmer, Nucl. Phys. B380 (1992) 147

30. A. Kuniba, T. Nakanishi and J. Suzuki, Nucl. Phys. B 356 (1991) 750

31. D. Gepner, in the proceedings of, “Nonperturbative methods in field theory”, Irvine (1987), World Scientific, p. 105, and Princeton University preprint PUPT 1049 (1987).

32. S. Cecotti, S. Ferrara and L. Girardello, Phys. Lett. B213 (1988) 443; Int. J. mod. Phys. 4 (1989) 2475; Phys. Lett. 213B (1988) 443

33. A. Strominger, Comm. Math. Phys. 133 (1990) 163

34. R. Koberle and J.A. Swieca, Phys. Lett. 86B (1979) 209

35. W. Lerche and N.P. Warner, Caltech preprint CALT–68–1747 (1991)

36. D. Gepner and J. Fuchs, Nucl. Phys. B294 (1987) 30

37. D. Gepner, Nucl. Phys. B290 (1987) 10

38. D. Gepner, Phys. Lett. 222B (1989) 207

39. U. Imbimbo, INFN Genoa preprint, GEF-TH-5-1992 (1992)

40. N. Jacobson, “Basic Algebra”, vol. 4, W.H. Freeman, New–York (1985)

41. A.B. Zamolodchikov and V.A. Fateev, Sov Phys. Jetp 62 (1985) 215; (Zh. Eksp. Theor. Fiz. 89 (1985) 380)

42. D. Gepner and Z. Qiu, Nucl. Phys. B285 (1987) 423

43. P. Goddard, A. Kent and D. Olive, Phys. Lett. 152B (1986) 105; Comm. Math. Phys. 103 (1986) 105

44. D. Kastor, E. Martinec and Z. Qiu, Phys. Lett. 200B (1988) 434

45. J. Bagger, D. Nemeschansky and S. Yankielowicz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (1988) 389

46. M. Douglas, Caltech preprint, CALT-68-1453 (1987)

47. G. Felder, K. Gawedzki and A. Kupiainen, Comm. Math. Phys. 117 (1988) 127

48. G. Moore and N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. 220B (1989) 422

49. J. Frohlich, In Como 1987 proceedings, Differential geometry methods in theoretical physics 219–259; B. Schroer, same volume, 219–259; J. Frohlich, Cargese Summer Inst. 1987, 71–100; L. Alvarez–Gaumé, same volume, 1–11

50. L.A. Gaumé, G. Sierra and C. Gomez, In Physics and mathematics of strings, Knizhnik memorial volume, pp. 16–184

51. G. Moore and N. Seiberg, Trieste spring school 1989, p.1

52. G. Moore and N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. 212B (1988) 451

53. L. Alvarez–Gaumé, C. Gomez and G. Sierra, Nucl.Phys. B330 (1990) 347

54. A.A. Belavin, A.M. Polyakov and A.B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. B241 (1984) 333

55. P.P. Kulish, N.Yu Reshetikhin and E.K. Sklyanin, Lett. Math. Phys. 5 (1981) 393

56. E. Date, M. Jimbo, T. Miwa and M. Okado, Lett. Math. Phys. 12 (1986) 209; Phys. rev. B35 (1986) 2907; Nucl. Phys. B290 [FS20] (1987) 231
57. T.R. Klassen and E. Melzer, Nucl. Phys. B338 (1990) 485
58. V. Pasquier, J. Phys 20 (1986) L217, L221
59. G.E. Andrews, R.J. Baxter and P.J. Forrester, J. Stat. Phys. 35 (1984) 193
60. R.J. Baxter, J. Phys. A 13 (1980) L61
61. A. Tsushiya and Y. Kanie, Lett. Math. Phys. 13 (1987) 303
62. L. Alvarez–Gaumé, C. Gomez and G. Sierra, Phys. Lett. 220B (1989) 142
63. D. Gepner and J. Fuchs, to appear
64. H. Wenzl, Representations of Hecke algebras and subfactors, Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis (1985), Invent. Math. 92 (1988) 349
65. A. Kato and Y. Kitazawa, Nucl. Phys. B319 (1989) 474
66. G. Sotkov and M. Stanishkov, Phys. Lett. 215B (1988) 674
67. B.R. Greene, C.A. Lutken and G.G. Ross, Nucl. Phys. B325 (1989) 101
68. M.R. Douglas and S.P. Trivedi, Nucl. Phys. B320 (1989) 461
69. J. Fuchs, A. Klemm, Ann. Phys. 194 (1989) 303; J. Fuchs, A. Klemm and C. Scheich, Z. Physik 46 (1990) 71; J. Fuchs, Phys. Rev. Lett 62 (1989) 1705
70. V. Pasquier, J. Phys. A20, (1987) L217
71. P. Fendley, J. Phys. A22 (1989) 4633
72. A.B. Zamolodchikov and V.A. Fateev, Yad. Fiz. 43 (1986) 1031
73. V. Pasquier, Comm. Math. Phys. 118 (1988) 355
74. A.B. Zamolodchikov, Princeton preprint PUPT 1195 (1990)
75. F.A. Smirnov, Int. J. Mod. Phys A6 (1991) 1407
76. T. Klassen and E. Melzer, Cornell and Stony Brook preprint, CLNS-92-1130, ITP-SB-92-01, (1992)

77. H.J. de Vega and V.A. Fateev, Int. Journal Mod. Phys. A6 (1991) 3221

78. V.A. Fateev and S.L. Lukyanov, "Kiev Lectures", ITP preprint (1988)

79. D. Bernard and A. LeClair, Phys. Lett. 247B (1990) 309

80. P. Fendley and K. Intriligator, Nucl. Phys. Nucl. Phys. B372 (1992) 533

Figure Captions

(2.1) The Young tableux for the field $[r_i] = [1,2,4,5] \equiv (s_i) = (1,2,4)$.

(7.1) A lattice interaction around the face model. The state variables are $a, b, c, \ldots$, and they obey the admissibility condition $a \sim b$, when a and b are on the ends of the same link. The Boltzmann weights are associated to the faces, $\omega \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$.

(7.2) The pictorial presentation for the star triangle equation (STE), eq. (7.3).

(7.3) Diagonal to diagonal transfer matrix, T, and its associated face transfer matrix, $T = \prod_i X_i(u)$. The face transfer matrix element is the Boltzmann weight, $\langle a_{i-1}, a'_i, a_{i+1} | X_i(u) | a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1} \rangle = w \begin{pmatrix} a_{i-1} & a'_i \\ a_i & a_{i+1} \end{pmatrix}$.

(7.4) The generators of the braid group, σ_i, braid the i'th and $(i+1)$'th strands. They obey eq. (7.9) which is one of the Reidemeister moves, see e.g., [81]. A typical braid, along with the action of σ, are drawn. The braids can be thought of as words in braid group operating on the trivial braid.

(7.5) The additional braiding relation on the sphere, eq. (11). On the sphere this braid is equivalent to the trivial one, around the north pole.

(7.6) The four point blocks $F_p(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)$ in the s-channel. The external primary fields i, j, k and ℓ obey $N^i_{p\rho} > 0$ and $N^i_{p\rho} > 0$.

(7.7) The braiding move on the s-channel blocks, implemented by the matrix C, eq. (7.13).

(7.8) The chiral vertex operator $\Phi_s(z)$, where $s = \binom{a}{bc}$ is a triplet of primary fields.

(7.9) The N-move takes an s-channel block to a t-channel one, and is implemented by the matrix $N_{pq} \begin{bmatrix} ij \\ k\ell \end{bmatrix}$.

(8.1) Examples of fusion graphs for some IRF models.

(10.1) The soliton scattering process $(a|n|b) + (b|v|d) \to (a|v|c) + (c|n|d)$.

(10.2) The pictorial description of the factorization equation.